

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA
CENTRAL
ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY


ACCESSION NO. 57346

CALL No. 378.1093416/San.

D.G.A. 79

fill me up to the brim &







100

THE UNIVERSITY OF NĀLANDĀ

57346

BY

HASMUKH D. SANKALIA, M.A., LL.B.

100

WITH A PREFACE

BY

Rev. H. HERAS, S.J., M.A.

*Director, Indian Historical Research Institute
St. Xavier's College, Bombay*



MADRAS

B. G. PAUL & CO., PUBLISHERS
12, FRANCIS JOSEPH STREET

1934

Thanks are due to the University of Bombay for giving a *substantial grant* for the publication of this work, and to the Department of Archaeological Survey of India for giving permission to reprint the illustrations and the diagrammatic plan of the site of Nālandā excavations.

—*The Author.*

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.
Acc. No. 57346
Date 14-3-1975
Call No. 31.8:1093416 + Sāu

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
TO
MY FATHER



PREFACE

THE monastic revolution started by Gautama Buddha in the sixth century before the Christian era developed into such an extraordinary institution that, even after its division into the two large branches of *Mahāyāna* and *Hinayāna*, it produced extraordinary results in knowledge and civilization. During a period that lasts roughly twelve centuries, all the wisdom of Northern India was centred round the Buddhist *vihāras* and *sāṅghārāmas*.

Many Buddhist monasteries undoubtedly flourished in India, about which we know practically nothing. Sānchi, Kāñheri, Ajanta, Ellora, Sāraṇāth, and a hundred more are only known through their archæological remains and a few inscriptions found on their walls or pillars. The ancient inhabitants of Āryāvarta were not fond of writing their own deeds. The most interesting information we possess about the Buddhist centres of learning in Northern India comes through the Chinese pilgrims. Mr. H. D. Sankalia in this work has taken two Chinese pilgrims as his main guides in the study of the history of one of those Buddhist institutions of learning, perhaps the greatest we know, the so-called University of Nālandā.

Now, that the Archæological Department of the Government of India has unearthed several monasteries of this institution, where Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing lived in the 7th century A.D. Mr. Sankalia considers it opportune to publish the result of his research in the history of Nālandā. The word "history" is rightly understood by the author of this book in its widest meaning. In this book the lover of Oriental learning will find not only a list of historical events, but also an account of the origin and a full explanation of the extraordinary spread of culture throughout the whole of Asia in the great days of Nālandā.

This preface, contributed at the request of Mr. Sankalia, is being written in front of another Buddhist monastery which may also have been in communication with Nālandā. Bāmiyān, in the centre of Afghanistan, was the last outpost of Buddhism towards the West. Hiuen Tsiang passed through it in the first half of the

7th century, and from Bāmiyān he visited India and Nālandā. Bāmiyān was in those days the centre of communications between India and Central Asia. Situated practically midway between Purushapura (Peshawar) and Bactres (Balkh), this valley (which was even then adorned with the beauties of nature that are reflected in the waters descending from the Koh-i-Baba snows) inherited the religion of India and the art of Bactriana. The large Buddhist communities that practised ascetism in this place, have left marks of their devotion to their Master and of their fondness for art, in the sculptures and paintings that still adorn their dwellings; their learning and condition of life is revealed in the scanty fragments of MSS. lately found in one of the caves by the French Archæological Delegation, which have been studied by Monsieur Silvain Lévi.

There are many points of contact between Nālandā and Bāmiyān which have been communicated to us by Huien-Tsiang. He tells us that in Bāmiyān there are ten convents and about one thousand priests. The number of caves found and examined hitherto ascend to the respectable figure of 2,000, which is a striking confirmation of the information given by the Chinese pilgrim. He mentions "a mountain, on the declivity of which is placed a stone figure of Buddha erect, in height 140 or 150 feet. Its golden hues," he continues, "sparkle on every side and its precious ornaments dazzle the eyes by their brightness." He also speaks of another convent "which was built by a former king of the country," who seems to be Kānishka. "To the east of the convent," he adds, "there is a standing figure of Sākyā Buddha, made of metallic stone, in height, 100 feet." As I write, I have only to turn my head to see the two colossal figures spoken of by the Chinese pilgrim.

In his book Mr. Sankalia enables the reader to visualise the wonders of Nālandā which were first described by the devout Chinese. Writing from Bāmiyān, I wish every success to this book on Nālandā.

Bāmiyān, Afghanistan,
8th September, 1934. }

H. HERAS, S. J.

INTRODUCTION

EVER since the name of Nālandā was brought to the notice of scholars by General Cunningham, antiquarians have attempted to shed more light on it from different angles, through the medium of journals and short manuals. In the following pages I have endeavoured not only to gather all that research has done in this direction, but to give a connected idea of the rise, the period of glory and fall of an institution that was the wonder of the Mediaeval and post-Mediaeval India. Many gaps, therefore, have been filled in.

I have approached the subject from the viewpoint that there existed a University at Nālandā, and it has been my constant aim to hold it up before the reader.

In order that this idea may be clearly comprehended, I had to touch upon some points which were perhaps outside my sphere. Thus, in Chapter II, I have tried to show that the University of Nālandā came into existence at a time, when a strong literary fervour, growing from age to age, had reached its zenith, that something like a University was but its natural outcome; further, that this University came to be established in the Buddhist *Saṅghārāmas* because the latter, ever since their foundation, were continually undergoing transformation, so much so that by the 5th century A.D., they had completely turned themselves into veritable Houses of Learning.

But mere literary fervour would not be strong enough to bring forth a University. There must be peace and prosperity, order and good government in the country so that new ideas may take root and develop.

After the Bhāraśivas and the Vākātakas, the redeemers of Āryāvarta from the Kushan scourge,¹ the

(1) *Vide Jayaswal, History of India*, p. 48.

Guptas, under Samudragupta, had ensured peace, prosperity and orderly government not only in Magadha but throughout the greater part of India. They brought back, besides these, all the great virtues—Holiness, Nobility and Toleration. It was, however, left to the successors of Samudragupta to utilise this heritage. To a man, they practised these virtues with an impartiality that was unimpeachable. They encouraged and patronised artists, poets and philosophers irrespective of caste and creed, with the result that the country rang with the exploits of these savants in the fields of art, literature and philosophy. Thus it was that Nālandā, though primarily a Buddhist institution, came to be founded by King Śakrāditya (Kumāragupta I), who himself was a devout Hindu.

Why the Guptas bestowed all their wealth and generosity upon Nālandā, of all the places in Magadha, I have explained in Chapter III. Nālandā, even in the days of Buddha and Mahāvira, was considered a fit place for spending the *cāturmāsa* (rain-retreat). And imbued with the holy memories of these Great Teachers, it gradually became a centre of learning and pilgrimage. Nālandā, therefore, was not such “an obscure and unimportant place” as Dr. Altekar has tried to make out in his recently published volume *Education in Ancient India* and much less, a place that was “not in any way connected with the life of Buddha, and therefore of any particular sanctity to the Buddhist world.” But centuries before the Guptas turned their eyes to Nālandā, it had become famous in the Buddhistic world.

A mere reference to Tāntrism in Chapter IV as a subject taught at Nālandā could hardly have been understood but by a few scholars had I not traced its growth and explained its nature in detail. Scholars interested in Tāntrism may be referred to the recent publications of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, under the able guidance of Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya. He was

particularly helpful to me in solving the Tāntric problems in the course of this thesis.

The chapter on "Ritualism of Nālandā Buddhism" deals, first, with the religious rites and ceremonies that were performed at Nālandā; secondly, it describes the various images found at Nālandā from the point of view of their iconography.

The chapter on "Nālandā To-day" sets out the nature of excavations and arrangement of buildings at Nālandā. Therein an attempt is made to identify the buildings so far excavated, with those of the kings mentioned by Hinen Tsiang. This identification, though perhaps uninteresting, is not a conjecture, but based on all the available evidence. Personal inspection of the site was necessary before writing this chapter. I was very fortunate in obtaining the help of the Rev. H. Heras, Director, Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay, who not only guided me during the whole course of my work, but also undertook the journey with me to the ruins and enlightened me on some archaeological peculiarities of Nālandā.

The chapter on "Art and Architecture of Nālandā" is written to acquaint the reader with the importance of Nālandā finds: it must find a place in the book, for it presupposes, as I have said in that chapter, the existence of a school of art and crafts there.

Some of the conclusions that are deduced as regards Nālandā, for instance, conclusions with regard to the date of the foundation of the University, its patrons etc., must, however, remain provisional, till not only the site at Nālandā but many others in Magadha are completely excavated; for at any moment, a coin, an image or an inscription may be discovered, which may, if not completely upset the findings, necessitate a revision thereof.

The history of Nālandā, based entirely on the Chinese and Tibetan sources and on the inscriptions of the Pālas, may be deemed one-sided as long as a confirmatory

opinion is not available from the contemporary Hindu sonrees. The silence of Bāṇa, the famous contemporary historian of the Court of King Harṣa, with regard to Nālandā, is not a little surprising. If the *Harṣa Carita* were written after Harṣa built *Saṅghārāmas* at Nālandā, Bāṇa might have referred to it. It is possible that Bāṇa wrote the *Harṣa Carita* before Harṣa patronised Nālandā; but it is more probable that he passed over Nālandā as it was a Buddhist institution. However, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I have thought it expedient to rely upon the Chinese and Tibetan documents.

BOMBAY, }
5th September, 1934. } H. D. SANKALIA.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	..	vii
INTRODUCTION	..	ix
LIST OF PLATES AND MAPS	..	xviii
BIBLIOGRAPHY	..	xix
ABBREVIATIONS	..	xxvi

CHAPTER I

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY—	1
----------------------------------	---

The application of the word 'University' to the educational institutions at Nālandā—1, Primary meaning of the word 'University'—1, Its secondary meanings—1, Its present significance—1, The aim of education—2, Need of Theology in the curriculum—3, Was there a parallel institution like a University in India?—3, Significance of the word 'Upaniṣad'—3, The aim of education in India—4, *Āśramas* and *Vihāras*—4.

CHAPTER II

PART I. THE BACKGROUND OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NĀLANDĀ—	5
---	---

Conditions necessary for the rise of a University—5, Need of literature—5, The literature which the University of Nālandā inherited—6, Its division into Buddhist and non-Buddhist—6, Curriculum that was prevalent prior to the foundation of the University—6, A survey of the landmarks in the history of Indian education—6, The Pāṇini-age and its curriculum—7, Contribution to the curriculum of the Pāṇini-age by—. The *sāṃkhya*-system—10, The primitive Buddhism—12, *Yoga*, *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika*—13-16, Philosophical systems of Nāgārjuna, Āśaṅga and Vasubandhu—16-20, The rise of Buddhist Logic—21, The University of Nālandā founded at a time when Indian thought had attained an acme of perfection—23.

PART II. TRANSFORMATION OF SĀNGHĀRĀMAS INTO TEMPLES OF LEARNING—	24
---	----

Nālandā—A Buddhist *sāṅghārāma*—24, The Buddhist *Saṅgha*—24, Its history—25, The rain-retreat—25, The purpose of *vihāras*—27, The nature of Buddhist *saṅgha*—29-31, Changes in the nature of

Buddhism cause changes in the aims of Buddhist *vihāras*—31, Study of secular arts and sciences introduced in the Buddhist *vihāras*—31, Two kinds of students—32, Monasteries in Europe and India—32, Indian converted into Houses of Learning—32.

CHAPTER III

THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS GROWTH UNDER KINGS OF VARIOUS DYNASTIES—, 33

Traditional and legendary accounts in Indian History—33, Hiuen Tsiang's legendary account of the foundation of *saṅghārāmas* at Nālandā—33, Its consideration—34, The etymological explanation of the name 'Nālandā'—35, Nālandā, a sacred place oft visited by Buddha and Gosāla—36, Aśoka, Nāgārjuna and Nālandā—37, Fa-hien speaks of Nalagrāma and not Nālandā—38, Reasons—38-39, Summary of the causes why Nālandā of all places in Magadha became a seat of learning—40-41, Hiuen Tsiang's account of the various kings who built *saṅghārāmas* at Nālandā—41-45, Examination of the soothsayer's prophecy—42, Identification of the kings mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang—46-51, The date of the royal-rise of Nālandā—51-53, Other kings who patronised Nālandā—53-61, Description of the Nālandā buildings—62-64.

CHAPTER IV

STUDIES OF NALANDĀ—, 65

Hiuen Tsiang's account of curriculum followed at Nālandā—65, Nālandā, a teaching University—66, Method of examination—66-67, Study of Theology compulsory—67, Nālandā, a centre of 'Sky-flower' doctrine—68-69, Efforts made by its pandits to popularize it—69-72, Śāntideva's *Śikṣa-Samuccaya*—70-72, Study of Logic as important as Theology—72, Contribution of the pandits of Nālandā to the development of Logic—73-78, Nālandā's efforts to spread its teachings by composing encyclopaedical works—78, Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgraha*—78, Śāṅkhya's *Satkāryavāda* and its refutation by Śāntarakṣita—80-82, Importance of *Tattvasaṅgraha*—82, Śāntarakṣita's other works and style—83-84, Kamalaśila—84-85, Study of Astronomy at Nālandā—85, *Tantra*, another important item of the curriculum—86, Different views with regard to the origin of *Tantrism*—86-87, *Tantrism* indigenous to Buddhism—87, Factors that brought about *Tantrism*—88-90, The doctrines of *Karuṇā* and *Mahāsukhavāda*—88-89, Earliest work on *Tantra*—91, The aims of the Tāntrics—91, Mantras and Dhāraṇīs and their importance in *Tantrism*—92-94, Evaluation of Tāntric culture—95-100, Real significance of the Tāntric terms and practices—97-98, Tāntric and Upaniṣadic cultures compared—100.

CHAPTER V**FAMOUS PANDITS OF NĀLANDĀ—, 102**

Significance of the word 'Pandita'—102, Traditionally Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, Pandits of Nālandā—103, Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu—103-104, Diinnāga—104-105, Sthiramati and Dharmapāla—105-109, Sīlabhadra succeeds Dharmapāla — 109-112, Consideration of Dharmakīrti's victory over Kumārila and Śaṅkara—112-115, Sāntideva and the great miracle—115-117, Śāntarakṣita, Padmasambhava and Kainalaśīla—117-122, Viradeva—123, Harṣa's tribute to the Pandits of Nālandā—125, Customs and manners of the Pandits—125-127.

CHAPTER VI**RITUALISM OF NĀLANDĀ BUDDHISM—, 128**

Practical side of the study of Theology—128, Worship of images—128, The morning bath—128-129, Ablution of the Hoiy Image—129, *Caityavandana* in the evening—129-131, Iconographical description of the images found at Nālandā—131-139, Buddha and Bodhisattvas—132-133, The goddesses Hārītī and Tārā—134-135, Gods and goddesses of the later Mahāyāna pantheon—135-138, Images of the Hindu pantheon found at Nālandā—138-139, Is there any relation between the Hindu and the Buddhist pantheon ?—139, Changes in the ritualism of Nālandā—140.

CHAPTER VII**STUDENT LIFE—, 141**

The Buddhist Student—141, A student's education before he entered Nālandā—142-145, Nālandā, a University of Universities—145, Method of teaching at Nālandā—146-147, Nature of the Matriculation Examination—147-148, The age at which a student entered Nālandā—148-149,—The state of discipline —149-152, Relation between the teacher and the taught—152-155, Dress of the student—155-158, Meals—158-160, Morality—160-162, Amusements —162-166, Dice-playing, a favourite pastime of the students—165, The number of students at Nālandā and other Universities—166-169, Aims and prospects of students—170-175, The value of Nālandā education—175-178.

CHAPTER VIII**CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITIES—, 179**

Valabhi on the western coast—179-180, Vikramāśīla—Its rise—181, Various views as to its location—181-182, Its founders—182,

Description of the buildings—182-183, Its famous Pandits—183, Atiśa—183-184, His visit to Tibet—184-185, Its historicity—185, A peep into the student-life—187-188, Other Universities, Odanta-puri and Jagaddala — 189, Comparison between Nālandā and Vikramaśilā—189-190.

CHAPTER IX

NĀLANDĀ—AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY—, 191

International students' concourse at Nālandā—191, Hiuen Tsiang at Nālandā—191-194, His refutation of the *Sāṃkhya* system—194-197, Other Chinese travellers who visited Nālandā according to I-Tsing—197, Those who came by the Northern route—197-198, Those who came by the Southern route—198-199, I-Tsing at Nālandā—199-200, Tibetan minister's son at Nālandā — 201, Scholars of Nālandā to foreign countries—201-203, Nālandā, the greatest centre of learning in India—203, Students flocked to it from all parts of India—203-204, The all-sidedness of Nālandā—205, What Nālandā did as centre of learning—206.

CHAPTER X

THE END OF NĀLANDĀ—,

207

Why could not Nālandā be rebuilt after its destruction by the Mohammedans—207-208, Reasons—208, The gradual unpopularity and downfall of Buddhism—208, Extraneous and internal causes of the downfall—208, Loss of royal patronage—208-209, Cultural degeneration—209-210, Saṅkara's refutation of its philosophy—210-211, Destruction of the visible existence of Buddhism, *viz.*, the Buddhist monasteries—211-212, Bakhtiyar Khilji attacks the Fort of Bihar—212, The date of destruction of the monasteries at Nālandā —212-214, Causes of the failure of Nālandā's regeneration after its destruction by the Mohammedans—214.

CHAPTER XI

NĀLANDĀ TO-DAY—,

216

The present site of Nālandā—216, Its archæological classification—217, Monastery No. 1, perhaps the oldest building at Nālandā—217, Were there storeyed buildings at Nālandā?—218, Monastery No. 1A—219-220, Stūpa site No. 3—220-221, The stone-temple—222-225, The University area—225, An attempt to identify the buildings mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang with the buildings that are unearthed—225-228.

CHAPTER XII

THE ART AND ARCHITECTURE OF NĀLANDĀ AS REVEALED FROM ITS FINDS—,	229
---	-----

Position of Nālandā in the development of Indian Art—229, Characteristics of the Pāla or Nālandā Art—230-232, The area influenced by the Nālandā Art—232-235, Nālandā and the Indo-Javanese Art—233-235, The architectural specimens of Nālandā buildings—235-238, Arched niches—238, Schools of arts and crafts at Nālandā—238.

CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUSION—,	239
--------------	-----

Nālandā upheld the ideals of the East and the West—239, Nālandā, a Temple of God—239, Nālandā fulfils Newman's conception of a University—239-240, How far Nālandā equipped the students to face the realities of life—240-241, Nālandā, the most magnificent Temple of Learning in Jambudvīpa—241.

APPENDIX	243
INDEX	247

LIST OF PLATES AND MAPS

PLATES

No. Facing
page.

The seal of Devapāladeva, with <i>Dharmacakra</i> and two gazelles on each side. Probably adopted by the University of Nālandā as its official seal ..	Frontis-piece.
Figure of Buddha (Bronze) from Nālandā ..	I 128
Figure of Buddha depicting scenes from His life from Jagdiśpura, near Nālandā ..	II 130
Maitreya (Future Buddha) from Nālandā ..	III 132
Bodhisattva from Nālandā (Indian Historical Research Museum), St. Xavier's College, Bombay.	IV 134
Bronze figure of 18-armed Tārā (?) from Nālandā ..	V 135
Mārīcī—a Buddhist goddess—from Nālandā ..	VI 136
Vajraśāradā—a Buddhist goddess—from Nālandā ..	VII 137
Apārajitā—a Buddhist goddess—from Nālandā ..	VIII 138
Monastery No. 1, Main Entrance, Nālandā ..	IX 216
Monastery No. 6, Nālandā ..	X 218
Stūpa-Site No. 3, Nālandā ..	XI 220
Bronze and gold figures of the Buddhist pantheon (from Kurkihār, near Gayā) ..	XII 228
Bronze and gold figures of the Buddhist pantheon (from Kurkihār, near Gaya) ..	XIII 230
Figure of Nāgārjuna (?) from Nālandā ..	XIV 232
Monastery No. 1B, Nālandā ..	XV 235
Bronze Stūpa from Monastery No. 1, Nālandā ..	XVI 236
Arched Niches of Nālandā ..	XVII 238

MAPS

India in the time of Nālandā	32
International Students' Concourse at Nālandā showing the various countries from which the students came to Nālandā	190
Radiation of Nālandā scholarship through the countries of Asia	200
Nālandā Excavations, Diagrammatic plan of site ..	225

BIBLIOGRAPHY SOURCES (Chinese)

FA-HIEN .. *A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms.*
Translated and annotated by
James Legge. 1886.

HIUEN TSIANG .. *Buddhist Records of the Western
World* (2 Vols.). Translated by
Samuel Beal. 1906.

SHAMAN HWUI LI. *The Life of Hiuen Tsiang.* Translated
by Samuel Beal. 1914.

I-TSING .. *A Record of Buddhist Religion.* Trans-
lated by J. Takakusu. 1896.

WATTERS, THOMAS. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.*
(2 Vols.). Edited by T.W. Rhys-
David. 1904.

SOURCES (Tibetan)

IN GERMAN

SCHIEFNER, A. .. *Taranatha's Geschichte des Buddhis-
mus in Indien.* Pittsburgh, 1869.

IN FRENCH

CORDIER, P. .. *Catalogue Du Fonds Tibétain de la
Bibliothèque Nationale.* Paris.
MDCCCXIX.

SOURCES (Sanskrit)

Gaina (Jaina) Sūtras. Part II. Sacred
Books of the East Series, Vol.
XLV.

Goutama—Dharma Sūtra. Government Oriental Library Series, Bibliotheca Sanskrita, No. 50, Mysore. 1917.

Manu Smṛti. Sacred Books of the East Series, Vol. XXV.

One Hundred and Eight Upanishads. Edited by Vasudev Laxman Shastri Pansikar, Bombay. 1913.

ŚAṄKARA .. *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*, Quarter I and II, Edited in the original Sanskrit, with Notes and English Translation by Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, Poona. 1923.

Śrimad Bhagavad Gītā.

Śrimad Bhāgavatam.

SOURCES (Buddhist-Sanskrit).

BENDALL, CECIL .. *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in The University Library, Cambridge.* 1883.

.. *A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf and Selected Paper MSS. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal.* Calcutta. 1915.

.. *Nyāya Praveśa*, Part I, Edited by Anandshankar B. Dhruva. Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. XXXVIII, Baroda. 1930.

ŚĀNTARAKṢITA .. *Tattvasaṅgraha*, Vols. I & II. Gaekwad Oriental Series, Nos. XXX, XXXI, Baroda. 1926.

ŚĀNTIDEVA .. *Śikṣhā-Samuccaya.* Translated by Cecil Bendall, London. 1922.

SARVAJÑA MITRA.. *Sragdharā Stotra Tīkā.* With a commentary by Jina Rakṣita.

SHASTRI, MM. H. P. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. In the Government Collection Under the Care of The Asiatic Society, Bengal, Buddhist MSS.*, Vol. I, Calcutta. 1917.

TUCCI GIUSEPPE .. *Pre-Diinnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic From Chinese Sources*, Baroda. 1929.

.. *Sukhāvativyūha*. Edited by F. Max Muller and Bunyiu Nanjio, Oxford. 1883.

.. *Vinaya Texts*, Sacred Books of the East Series, Volumes XIII, XVII, Parts I and II, Oxford. 1881—1882.

.. *Dialogues of the Buddha*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Volumes II, III & IV. Oxford University Press. 1899, 1910, 1921.

SOURCES (Tantra and Tantrism).

AVALON .. *Principles of Tantra*, Parts I and II, London. 1914.

.. *Advayavajrasaṁgraha*. Gaekwad Oriental Series, Baroda. 1927.

.. *Two Vajrayāna Works*. Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. XIIV, Baroda. 1929.

.. *Kāraṇḍa Vyūha*. Mahāyāna Sūtra. Calcutta. 1784.

.. *Shri Chakra Saṁbhāra Tantra*. A Buddhist Tantra. Edited by Kazi Dawa Sum Dup. Tantrik Texts, General Editor, Arthur Avalon, Volume VII. 1919.

.. *Guhyasamāja Tantra or Tathāgata-guhyaka*. Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. LIII, Baroda. 1931.

.. *Sādhanamālā*, Vols. I and II. Gaekwad Oriental Series, Nos. XXVI and XLI, Baroda. 1925 and 1928.

SOURCES (Archaeological, Epigraphical and Numismatic)

ALLAN, JOHN .. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and of Sasanka, King of Gauda*, London. 1914.

CUNNINGHAM .. *Archaeological Survey of India Reports*. 1861.
Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India. 1909—1928.

KURAISHI, M.A. .. *A Short Guide to the Buddhist Remains Excavated at Nālandā*, Calcutta. 1931.

FLEET, JOHN FAITHFULL .. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III. Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their Successors, Calcutta. 1888.

LITERATURE: (On Art, Architecture and Iconography)

COOMARASWAMY, A. K. *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, London. 1927.

COOMARASWAMY, A. K. *Introduction to Indian Art*, Madras. 1923.

FERGUSSON, JAMES *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, London. 1876.

GRUNWEDAL, ALBERT. *Buddhist Art in India*, London. 1901.

HAVELL, E. B. .. *The Ancient and Mediaeval Architecture of India. A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilisation*, London. 1915.

HAVELL, E. B. .. *Indian Architecture*, London. 1913.

LUDWIG BACHHOF- FER. *Early Indian Sculpture*, Vols. I and II, Paris. MCMXXIX.

BHATTACHARYYA, BENOYTOSH. *The Indian Buddhist Iconography*, Oxford University Press. 1924.

BHATTASALI NALI- NIKANTA. *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, Dacca. 1929.

GETTY, A. .. *Gods of Northern Buddhism*, Oxford. 1914.

LITERATURE (On Buddhism)

BOSE, PHANINDRA- NATH. *Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities*, Madras. 1923.

BOSE, PHANINDRA- NATH. *The Indian Teachers in China*, Madras. 1923.

COPLESTON .. *Buddhism—Primitive and Present, in Magadha and Ceylon*, London. 1892.

COOMARASWAMY, ANANDA. *Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, London. 1928.

DAS, S. C. .. *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*.

DUTT, NALINAK- SHA. *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools*, London. 1925.

DUTT, SUKUMAR .. *Early Buddhist Monachism*, London. 1924.

EITEL, E. J. .. *Hand-book for the Students of Chinese Buddhism*, London. 1876.

HARDY, SPENCE .. *Eastern Monachism*, London. 1850.

MITRA, RAJENDRA- LAL. *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, Calcutta. 1882.

MONIER-WILLIAMS. *Buddhism*, London. 1889.

NARIMAN, G. K. .. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, Bombay. 1923.

RYUKAN KIMURA. *A Historical Study of the Terms Hīna-yāna and Mahāyāna and the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, Calcutta. 1927.

VASU, N. N. .. *Modern Buddhism and Its Followers in Orissa*, Calcutta. 1911.

WADDELL .. *Lamaism or Buddhism of Tibet*, London. 1895.

LITERATURE (General)

ALTEKAR, A. S. .. *Education in Ancient India*, Benares. 1934.

BALFOUR, EDWARD *The Cyclopaedia of India and of Eastern and Southern Asia*, Vol. I, Third Edition, London. 1885.

Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, Edited with Introduction and Notes by Surendra Nath Majumdar Sastri, Calcutta. 1924.

DEY, NUNDOLAL .. *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, London. 1927.

DUTT, ROMEESH CHUNDER. *A History of Civilisation in Ancient India*. Revised Edition in Two Volumes, London. 1893.

JAYASWAL, K. P. .. *History of India*, Lahore. 1933.

RAY CHAUDHARI, HEMACHANDRA. *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta. 1923.

SAMADDAR, J. N. *The Glories of Magadha*, Second Edition, Patna. 1927.

SMITH, VINCENT A. *The Early History of India*, Fourth Edition, Oxford. 1924.

VENKATESWARA, S. V. *Indian Culture Through the Ages*, Vol. I. Longmans Green & Co. 1928.

Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Orientalia, Parts I-II-III.

Proceedings and Transactions of the Indian Oriental Conference.

K E I T H. ARTHUR BERRIEDALE. *Indian Logic and Atomism*, Oxford. 1921.

SUGIURA SADAJIRO. *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan*, Philadelphia. 1900.

VIDYABHUSANA, SATIS CHANDRA. *A History of Indian Logic*, Calcutta. 1921.

VIDYABHUSANA, S. C. *History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*, Calcutta. 1909.

NEWMAN, J O H N HENRY CARDINAL. *The Idea of a University*, New Edition. 1891 and 1910.

NEWMAN, J O H N HENRY. *Select Discourses from the Idea of a University*, Edited with Introduction by May Yardley, Cambridge. 1931.

RASHDALL, HASTINGS. *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Oxford. MDCCCV.

WALDEN, J. W. H. . . *Universities of Ancient Greece*, New York. 1909.

JOURNALS.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Epigraphia Indica.

Indian Antiquary.

Indian Historical Quarterly.

Journal, Asiatic Society, Bengal.

Journal, Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta.

Journal of the Buddhist Text Society.

Modern Review.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations of the titles of works of reference have been used in this book:

A. S. I. .. Archaeological Survey of India Reports.

A. S. I. A. R. .. Archaeological Survey of India Annual Reports.

E. I. or Ep. Ind. .. Epigraphia Indica.

Ind. Ant. .. Indian Antiquary.

J. A. S. B. .. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

J. B. T. S. .. Journal of the Buddhist Text Society.

I. H. Q. .. Indian Historical Quarterly.

J. R. A. S. .. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

J. B. O. R. S. .. Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

A. B. O. R. S. .. Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

S. B. E. .. Sacred Books of the East.

His. Ind. Indo. Art. .. History of Indian and Indonesian Art.

A. M. S. J. Vols. .. Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes.

I. L. A. .. Indian Logic and Atomism.

H. I. L. .. History of Indian Logic.

H. L. .. Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan.

Bronzes of Nālandā .. The Bronzes of Nālandā and Hindu Javanese Art.


G. O. S. .. Gaekwad Oriental Series.



THE SEAL OF DEVAPALADEVA

with Dharmachakra and two gazelles on each side.

Probably adopted by the University of Nalanda as its official seal
(cf. HIRANANDA SASIBRI *Ep. Ind.* XXI p. 73)



THE UNIVERSITY OF NALANDA

CHAPTER I THE IDEAL OF A UNIVERSITY

THE idea of a University, it would be thought, was foreign to India. It might therefore be asked, "How could it be applied to an institution which was purely Indian?" Therefore, before we use it with reference to the educational institutions that flourished at Nālandā, we must, first, needs, know what is meant by a University and then see how far, with propriety, we could apply it to Nālandā.

The word 'University' originally had the sense of a number or aggregate of persons. In this sense, it was applied to a scholastic body of teachers or scholars, but never to a place, where such a body was established, or even to its collective schools.¹

In course of time, it was used with reference to an institution which embraced all the arts and sciences,² whereas Newman called that a University which held out invitation to students of every kind.³

The word 'University' then, has a definite meaning and significance. It stands first, for a place which imparts knowledge in all the a.'s and sciences secondly, for a place which holds out invitation to students of every kind from all over the world.

(1) See Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 1, p. 6.

(2) Mosheim, *Hist.* Vol. II, p. 529, referred to by Newman, *The Idea of a University*, p. 20.

(3) Newman, o. c., p. 20. Rashdall however says that this interpretation is nothing but the appropriation of the word "*studium generale*".

But a University, besides this, has definite views with regard to the students it admits to its portals and also with regard to the education it imparts. As regards the former, it admitted only those students who possessed the requisite qualifications and no other. As to the latter, it sought to give the right type of education, which is defined by Newman as one that acts upon our mental nature and the formation of character. "It is," says he, "something individual and permanent, and is commonly spoken of in connection with religion and virtue."¹ The aim of education, thus, was the spiritual advancement of the student, and not any material gain—"some art, or business, or profession or work as resulting from it and as its complete and real end."²

Right type of education² as Newman further tells us, is that which makes one a 'gentleman,' whom he characterises as one who has a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind and a noble or courteous bearing in the conduct of life.³ These qualities are the results of large knowledge. And this knowledge, according to Newman, comprises not only subjects such as Grammar, Logic, and Astronomy, but also important and abstruse ones, such as Philosophy and Theology.⁴

(1) Newman, o. c., p. 108. We may as well compare what Emperor Julian said of education, "Right education, I consider to be not the gracefulness that resides in words and on tongue, but a healthy disposition of an intelligent mind and true opinion about the good and the bad, the noble and the base." from Walden, *Universities of Ancient Greece*, p. 110-n.

(2) Newman, o. c., p. 165.

(3) *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121.

(4) Perhaps those at the helm of our British Indian Universities will wonder at the inclusion of Theology. "What has Theology to do", they might ask, "with the University or Liberal Education?", and paradoxical as it would seem, our Universities have no such subject as Theology, when we find that all the ancient Universities of India and Europe, Takṣaśila, Nālandā, Paris and Oxford respectively, had a special chair for Theology. Even up to this day, in Oxford, Theology continues to occupy the same high position as it did, when the University was first founded. The Universities of Benares and Aligarh have done well to fill up this long-felt want in the equipment of the students' educa-

Theology should be included in the curriculum, because, as Newman says, it is not a mere acquaintance with the scriptures, but is the Science of God, or truths we know about God put into a system.¹ Religious training, so defined, would not narrow the outlook of the student (as it ~~will~~¹⁴ possibly do in the Hindu and the Moslem University), but would instil in him a catholicity of outlook and would teach him to place reason above emotion rather than be a victim of the latter.

Having thus known what, in short, was the ideal of a University in Europe, let us see whether there was an institution or even a word in India, which connoted an idea similar to a University, before we discuss, in the chapters that follow, how far the educational institutions at Nālandā could be called a University.

For an educational institution like a University, we have to go back far into the history of education in ancient India. Here the word 'Upaniṣad' itself seems to serve our need. Literally, it means "to approach for instruction". Nevertheless, it presupposes a teacher or group of teachers whom the student or students approached for knowledge. This knowledge, as we learn from the *Upaniṣadas* themselves² and from the interpretation of the word 'Upaniṣad', was not divulged to an unworthy student.³ A student, thus, was required to have the necessary qualification before he could approach for higher knowledge. This knowledge as we learn from Nārada, embraced all the then known arts and sciences.⁴ Lastly, instruction in this knowledge was not confined to a

tion by making Theology, be it Hinduism or Islam, compulsory for their students.

(1) Newman, o. c., p. 61.

(2) The word 'Upaniṣad' is interpreted to mean secret doctrine. See for instance *Nṛṣiṇīha uttara tāpani upaniṣad*, where we meet with the phrase "iti rahasyam" no less than four times.

(3) The best known instance is that of Naciketas in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, who realised the secret of death by persistent effort, while Virocana, as we learn from *Chāndogya*, V, 11, returned empty-handed.

(4) *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII, 2. For a fuller reference, see Chap. II, p. 8.

class or sect or students, but to all, provided they were well-equipped.¹

The ideal of this knowledge was not in the least material. Not only was it spiritual, but it was transcendental. For “Not the knowledge of the *Vēdas*, etc.”, said the Upaniṣadic philosopher, “is true knowledge. That alone is true knowledge which ends in the realization of Brahma, of Akṣara”.²

Thus, even as early as the Upaniṣadic times, India had evolved a system of education which, in spite of its extreme simplicity, would stand comparison, so far as the essentials are concerned, with similar organisations of the Occident known as ‘City schools’, ‘*Studium generale*’, ‘University’ etc. In course of time this system came to be introduced or was prevalent in the *āśramas*, *mathas*, and *vihāras*. Nālandā was one of such *vihāras*. Let us see how far it embodied the aims and ideals of educational institutions of the East and the West.

(1) Cf. for instance the case of Satyakāma Jābāla, *Chāndogya*, IV, 4 ff.

(2) *Muṇdaka Upaniṣad* 1, 5. Cf. also *Sā vidyā yā vimuktaye*.

CHAPTER II

PART I

THE BACKGROUND OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NĀLANDĀ

FOR the formation of a state, a territory and the people who would inhabit that territory are necessary. For framing the laws of a constitution, there must exist first the constitution *de facto*. In fact, for all human institutions the first requisite is matter. This matter may vary according to the needs of institutions. For the laws of a constitution, as we said above, we require the constitution itself. For an institution like the University of Nālandā what we require is matter in the shape of literature, using the word literature in a loose sense so as to comprise religion, philosophy, science, art and so forth.

So before a great University like Nālandā comes into being, there must be in existence a great and vast literature which the University may take upon itself to teach and to expound. This does not mean that the University confines itself to the work already done, and that it creates nothing new.¹ We shall see in the following chapters how Nālandā professors turned their activities into new channels like Nyāya, Tantra, etc., and wrote stupendous volumes on these subjects. The Nālandā University, in this respect, was very fortunate. Unlike the Mediæval European Universities of Salerno, Bologna and Paris,² the period that preceded the rise of the Nālandā University was characterised by an intellectual fervour unknown to the history of any country. India had not known

(1) According to Newman, however, this is never the aim of a University. Its sole aim is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement. o. c., Preface, p. IX.

(2) See Rashdall. o. c., I, p. 26.

anything like "Dark Ages" in her intellectual history, before the invasion of the Moslems in the 12th century A.D. This is true, notwithstanding the fact that India was overrun more than once by foreigners,—once by the Greeks under Alexander and then by the various hordes of the Huns, and (in spite of the fact) that India was at no period of her history completely free from internal wars of aggrandisement between her different political chiefs. Nālandā had, therefore, a very rich heritage to fall back upon.

This heritage we may divide into two parts—Buddhist and non-Buddhist. The non-Buddhist part, to give only a bare outline, would include *Vēdas*, *Vēdānta*, works on such philosophical systems, as the *Sāñkhya*, *Vaiśeṣika* and other branches of knowledge that will be enumerated hereafter. The Buddhist division would include the various teachings of Buddha contained in the *Vinaya Pitaka*, *Dhammapāda*, *Abhidhamma Pitaka*, *Majjhima Nikāya*, *Sutta Pitaka* and others.

But more than these, there were works which were of greater importance, works which tried to expound the inner teachings of Buddha, such as *Prajñāpāramitā* and commentaries thereon composed by Nāgārjuna, Maitreya, Āśaṅga, Vasubandhu and others, who had given Buddhism its philosophy.

We see, therefore, that the ground was already prepared for the foundation of a great University, a University that would attract students from many a foreign land.

Another thing that must draw our attention is the curriculum that was prevalent, prior to the foundation of the University. As this curriculum consisted of various curricula, we shall have a rapid survey of them, and see how these varying items of education came to be consolidated into one harmonious whole. This survey may well be called a survey of the various landmarks in the history of education in ancient India. For a distinct addition and alteration was made in the curriculum at each period.

The age of Pāṇini, 600-700 B. C., we take as our first landmark.¹ For he immediately succeeds the latest compilers of the *Upaniṣads* and the author of *Nighantu*,—Yāska. Pāṇini, moreover, represents the Sūtra-period in the development of various kinds of Indian literature.²

The curriculum in the time of Pāṇini, then, was approximately as follows:

Besides the four *Vēdas*, we find that several other subjects of study were taught in those days. They were:—

- (1) *Anuśāsana*, which according to Sāyana, is the name given to the six *Vēdāṅgas*, viz.:
 - (a) *Śikṣā* (Phonetics), (b) *Kalpa* (Ritualistic knowledge), (c) *Vyākaraṇa* (Grammar), (d) *Nirukta* (Exegetics), (e) *Chandas* (Metrics) and (f) *Jyotiṣa* (Astronomy).
- (2) *Vidyā*, meaning *Sarvavidyā* or *Viśvavidyā*.
- (3) *Vākovākyam*, explained by Śaṅkara as the art of disputation.
- (4) *Itihāsa-Purāṇa*.
- (5) *Ākhyāna*.
- (6) *Anvākhyāna*.
- (7) *Anuyākhyāna*, interpreted by Śaṅkara as explanation of Mantras.
- (8) *Vyākhyāna*.
- (9) *Gāthā*.
- (10) *Nārāśāmīṣī*.
- (11) *Brāhmaṇa*.
- (12) *Kṣātra Vidyā*, explained by Śaṅkara as the science of the bows.
- (13) *Rāśi*; Śaṅkara explains it as the science of numbers or arithmetic.

(1) Belvalkar, *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 16. Keith, (*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 426), however, opposes this view, and assigns 400 B.C., as the earliest date to Pāṇini. He however agrees with our two subsequent statements.

(2) Cf. Keith, o. c., p. 425. He, however, places him in about 350 B.C.

- (14) *Nakṣatra Vidyā*.
- (15) *Bhūta Vidyā*, interpreted differently by Macdonell, Śaṅkara, and Raṅga Rāmānuja, as demonology, the science of life, and the art of controlling, respectively.
- (16) *Nidhi*, probably some sort of divination.
- (17) *Sarpa-Vidyā*.¹
- (18) *Atharvāṅgirasa*.
- (19) *Daiwa*, explained by Śaṅkara as the science of portents.
- (20) *Pitrya*, the science of manes.
- (21) *Sūtra*, in the sense of a book of rules for the guidance of sacrifices, and other rituals.
- (22) *The Vēdās of Vēdās*. (*Vēdānām Vēdam*), explained by Śaṅkara to mean “Grammar of old Sanskrit”.
- (23) *Ekayāna*, literally “the only correct path”, explained by Śaṅkara as the science of conduct.
- (24) *Dēva vidyā*, explained by Śaṅkara and Raṅga Rāmānuja as *Nirukta* or Exegetics and the science of the worship of gods respectively.
- (25) *Dēvajñāna-Vidyā*, explained by Śaṅkara as the arts affected by the lesser gods, such as, the making of perfumes, dancing, singing, playing on musical instruments and other fine arts.

The above is rather an exhaustive list of subjects collected by Dr. Radhamukund Mookerji,² from various *Brāhmaṇas* and *Upaniṣads*. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* alone gives a fairly good number of subjects. Says Nārada³ to Sanatkumāra: “ I have studied, most Reverend Sir, the *Rigvēda*, the *Yajurvēda*, the *Sāmavēda*, the *Atharvavēda* as fourth, the epic and the mythological poems as the fifth *vēda*, grammar, arithmetic, divina-

(1) Perhaps the same as (2) p. 7.

(2) *Ancient Hindu Education, as evidenced by the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads*, Sir Asutosh Mookerji Silver Jubilee, III, *Orientalia*, part I, pp. 217-251.

(3) *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII, 1.

tion, chronology, dialectics, politics, theology, necromancy, the art of war, astronomy, snake-charming, and the fine arts."

It need not be imagined that all students were as versatile as Nārada. There can be no greater misconception than that. The inference that we draw from these curricula is that ancient Hindus studied many other subjects besides the four *Vēdas*, the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*. It is difficult to say, however, whether these different subjects were taught at one place as at Nālandā¹, or at different places noted for their specialisation in particular branches of knowledge.

Repeated references to Takṣaśilā² as an academy for medical studies show that it took a long time before educational centres like Nālandā came to be founded where Philosophy, Theology, Science and even Medicine were taught,³ and that, before their rise these subjects were taught not at one place but at different places famed in particular branches of knowledge.

But the subjects, that we most commonly come across in the old curriculum before Pāṇini and even after him are summarized below even at the cost of repetition. For it was this curriculum that underwent a change from time to time.

There were the *Vēdas*, *Rg*, *Yajur*, *Sāma* and *Atharva*.

- The student specialised in any one of the four ; if he was a student above the average and had the requisite energy, means and leisure he mastered more than one *Vēda*.

The various *Brāhmaṇas* such as *Aitarēa*, *Taittirīya*, *Tāṇḍya*, *Śatapatha*, as appendices to each *Vēda*, come next.

Upaniṣads, the philosophical treatises, however, formed the most interesting, though abstruse, part of the students' curriculum. Here they came across that which did not require mere memory work but great meditation.

(1) Shaman Hwui Li, *The life of Hiuen Tsiang*. Tr. Beal, p. 112.

(2) For instance, *See Mahāvagga*, VIII, 1, 6. where we are told that Jīvaka Komarabhakka went to Takṣaśilā to study medicine.

(3) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 112.

After the *Upaniṣads* comes, the *Sūtra* literature. This was divided into three parts. There were the *Srauta sūtras*, dealing with the details of the ceremonial relating to Vedic rituals. Next come the *Dharma sūtras*, which prescribed the duties of a man in all the spheres of his life. His duties as a *Brahmacārin*, that is when he is a student, his duties when he is a householder, his duties when he retires to a forest as a *Vānaprasthāśramī*, and as a *Sanyāsī* are enumerated with meticulous precision, by these *sūtras*. These *sūtras* also deal with the duties of a king and many other things. They, in short, tell us of the religious, social and legal duties of an individual. *Gṛhya sūtras* dealing with the domestic life of a person form the last part of this *Sūtra* literature. Another branch of study that a student before Pāṇini or in his times used to take up was the Science of Pronunciation called *Śikṣa* or Phonetics. Mention may be made of *Chandas* or Metre as a branch of science studied by the student. *Nirukta* or Etymology was also a widely known science at that time, and continued to be so even in the centuries that followed. Lastly comes *Jyotiṣa* or Astrology.

Despite so many other subjects besides the *Vēdas*, the *Vēdas* constituted the principal part of student's education. Consequently education in India was primarily religious and continued to be such till the advent of Western education.

The *Sāṃkhya* system may be taken as forming a second landmark in the history of education. Its founder Kapila flourished somewhere about the 7th century B.C.,¹ i.e., about a century or two before Buddha. It was he, who for the first time put purely atheistic ideas before a people steeped in ritualism and who believed in a host of gods and goddesses. He propounded a theory of the Universe in which God had no place. He instead put forward a duality; Nature (*Prakṛti*) and Spirit (*Puruṣa*). The whole Universe except the *Puruṣa* originated from this *Prakṛti*; and the *Puruṣa* was only linked with the

(1) Keith, o.c., p. 488, opposes this view. To him, views, believing in the existence of Kapila and the antiquity of the *Sāṃkhya* system, appear groundless, though he does not assign any definite period to that system.

Prakṛti. Moreover, he said that the *Puruṣa* was different in every individual, and had separate existence after its emancipation—from the bonds of *Prakṛti*. Kapila, thus, ran counter in his views to the Upaniṣadic ones, both in his theory of the creation of the Universe and in his theory of the Spirit. This new philosophy drew many students. Some were attracted by it because they found in it an escape from the Vedic ritualism; some, because they could not be convinced by the Upaniṣadic doctrines about the existence of God and the creation and destruction of the Universe; some, because of its close reasoning; others, because they wanted to study the new philosophy in order to compare and criticise it. That the new philosophy was the centre of attraction for the types of students aforesaid, can be seen from the number of champions and opponents the *Sāṅkhya* system had, from its very inception till the end of the 14th century. If Īśvara Kṛṣṇa and Vārṣaganya wrote works in favour of it, in the fifth century A.D., Vasubandhu and other prominent Buddhist scholars wrote its refutation in the same century (A.D. 400).¹ Even it had its share of attack from the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang, who according to the biographer² silenced and converted the opponent. Śaṅkara's, Rāmānuja's and Vallabha's refutations of the system are too well-known even to need a mention.

Sāṅkhya-system, thus, made a splendid contribution to the old curriculum of the Pāṇini age. But another surprise was in store for the orthodox Brahmanism which was already assailed by the atheistic *Sāṅkhya*. Yet another doctrine, this time agnostic, made its appearance on this philosophy-fed land. Buddhism, like *Sāṅkhya*, did not categorically deny the existence of God. And instead of entering upon discussions about the existence of God and creation of the Universe, it confined itself to its object, *viz.*, to afford humanity relief from the suffering and pain to which all living beings are subject at

(1) See Takakusu, Paramatha's Life of Vasubandhu, *J.R.A.S.* 1905, p. 47.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 161-164.

sometime or other. Here we do not propose to deal with Buddhism as a religion. Suffice it to mention the various works which contained the tenets and preachings of its founder.

Buddhism, when originally propounded, say, between the period 522 B.C. and 477 B.C.,—the period when Buddha first became Enlightened, and the years in which he preached his doctrine¹ had no regular books containing the doctrine of Buddha. Nay, even after his death, his teachings were transmitted from generation to generation only orally. It was in the last century of the pre-Christian period or in the beginning of the New Era that they were reduced to writing. The writings being collected together are metaphorically called *Pitakas* (Baskets or Boxes). They are *Sutta Pitaka*, *Vinaya Pitaka* and *Abhidhamma Pitaka*. The above is merely a sketch of the primitive Buddhism, which was essentially ethical. We shall deal with the history of schism in the Buddhist camp into various schools, the development of Buddhist philosophy with the discovery of *Prajñāpāramitā*, and philosophical commentaries on it by Nāgārjuna and others, in their respective places. Now, before we revert to the Buddhist philosophy we have to take into account the rise of new systems that originated during the interval when Buddhism was making a steady progress, and their contribution to the curriculum.

The modification that primitive Buddhism had made in the curriculum of the Kapila-age² was very little, because the preachings and doctrines of Buddha were primarily studied in the Buddhist *vihāras*, by those who had embraced Buddhism. These students, who were generally *Bhikkhus*, never troubled themselves about other studies, of the *Vēdas*, etc. Hindu institutions—*gurukulas* and the like, similarly, did not introduce the study of Buddhist doctrines, as it was feared that it

(1) Buddha was born in 563 B. C. and died in 483. See Coomaraswami, *Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, p. 9.

(2) We should better say *Sāṃkhya*-age, for the very existence of Kapila is doubted. See Keith, o.c., p. 488.

might divert the students to Buddhism. Whatever modifications were effected by Buddhism in the curriculum, were effected by it, when philosophy entered it, and these modifications we will study in the pages that follow.

The new systems that came into existence in the transition period, during which Buddhism was slowly developing, were *Yoga*, *Nyāya*, and *Vaiśeṣika*.

The *Yoga* philosophy supplied what the *Sāṃkhya* lacked. Its author Pātañjali¹ lived somewhere about the 2nd century B.C. The *Sāṃkhya* believed in no god, "the *Yoga* advocated faith in a Supreme Deity, as well as some mystic practices and meditation by which beatitude could be obtained."² Here was something for those who were not satisfied with the *Sāṃkhya*, to pin their faith to, believing all the while in the *Sāṃkhya* dialectics also. Moreover, the very reasons which drew students to the *Sāṃkhya* system, also drew students to this new system. This *Yoga* system caused some wonderful changes. The atheistic *Sāṃkhya*-system it almost converted into theistic;³ it made itself acceptable on account of some of its practices even to the *Vēdāntins*,⁴ while its influence on Buddhism was so great that one of its schools was called *Yogācāra*.

But it was the *Nyāya* system⁵ that wielded greater influence on the curriculum of the students than either the *Yoga* or

(1) This Pātañjali is not be confused with the Pātanjali of the *Mahābhāṣya*, See Keith, o.c., p. 490. Keith says that the germs of *yoga* practices, meditation, etc., can be found in all religions, even in Buddhism and Jainism, though it is closely allied with *Sāṃkhya*.

(2) Dutt, *Ancient India*, p. 320.

(3) Cf. Keith, o.c., p. 400, who calls *Yoga* "theistic *Sāṃkhya*."

(4) Cf. Śaṅkara, *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*, adhyāya II, pāda, 1, sūtra 3: "Yēna tu aṁśēna na virudhyētē, tēneśtamēva sāṃkhayoga smṛtyoḥ-sāvakāśtvam."

"And we quite acknowledge that the *Sāṃkhayoga smṛtis*, in that portion where they do not contradict the *Vēda*, to have a claim to authoritativeness."

(5) We have purposely refrained from ascribing the authorship of the system to Gotama or Aksapāda as done by Dutt (o.c., p. 324) as their very existence is doubted by modern scholars, though even Chinese and Japanese sources attribute the inception of it to Aksapāda. See

the *Vaiśeṣika*. That the *Nyāya* had had a great hold upon the students' mind can be seen from the fact that "Nyāya is still a favourite study in India, and we have students from Kashmire and Rajputana and Northern India attending the celebrated *Nyāya* Schools in Navadvīpa in Bengal, living in the houses of their teacher and pursuing their studies for years together, in the very same way, in which students among the Magadhas and Āṅgas and Kosalas and Videhas pursued their studies when Gautama, the logician lived and taught."¹ Even up to this day, the Benares Hindu University awards a special prize to a student, who shows proficiency in *Nyāya*.

We do not propose to go into the system itself, but will content ourselves with the changes it wrought upon the existing curriculum.

The religious side of the original system was not much cared for, but its technical side which deals with the subjects to be discussed, namely, the various *Pramāṇas*, etc., was greatly exploited by the Buddhist, Jain and Hindu pandits. Diñnāga, and Dharmakīrti among the Buddhist made various improvements in Logic.² Diñnāga, for instance, reduced the number of *Pramāṇas* to only two.³ Siddhasena Divākara⁴ composed many manuals in Logic, in which he sought to refute the Buddhist logicians. *Nyāya*, more properly *Tarka*, was used by propounders and propagandists of different religious philosophies,—the Buddhist, Jain and Hindu, to attack their opponents' system.

Logic has always attracted the student-world not only in India but even in Europe of the 10th and 11th centuries. "The one stimulating and interesting morsel," writes Rashdall,⁵

Keith, o.c., p. 482; M. M. H. P. Sastri, *J. A. S. B. N. S. I.*, 1905, p. 177. This much, however, is certain that the *Nyāya Sūtra* representing earlier thoughts probably developed in the 1st century A.D., Keith, o.c., p. 483.

(1) Dutt, o.c., p. 324.

(2) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 180

(3) See Sastri, *J. R. A. S. N. S. I.*, 1905.

(4) Siddha Sena Divākara, *Nyāyāvatāra*.

(5) Rashdall, o.c., p. 38.

“which the monastic teacher could place before the hungry intellect of the inquiring student was a morsel of Logic.” Logic, however, was not studied for its own sake. The student had some higher ideal before him, and that ideal was the realisation of the truth or true knowledge. Here we find that the Indian student had something in common with his European brother. Let us see by what imperceptible steps, the student, who embarked upon the study of Logic, gained his ideal. “Yet no sooner does he approach it”, continues the same author,¹ “than the student finds himself led by imperceptible steps from Logic into Physics and from Physics into Metaphysics and from Metaphysics into Theology.” *Nyāya* system had no other object than this. For among other things, in the list of things to be Proved, we find such things as Soul and Emancipation.² This, in fact, was the ultimate goal of all systems of Logic that sprung after Gotama. The Jain³ manuals of Logic set forth the same aim, the goal to be realised.

Nyāya thus completely revolutionised the old curricula of the previous ages. It became an integral part of the new curriculum of the students.

The other system, *Vaiśeṣika* was propounded by Kaṇāda.⁴ His date is not known, but he flourished in, as Dutt calls, the “Rationalistic Period.”⁵ The creation and destruction of the Universe were here explained in a more or less scientific way. In later times *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* went hand in hand as *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga*. The influence of this system can be measured from the fact that since its advent in the field of philosophies, it drew attention of sympathetic as well as hostile students. It became a target of attack both for the Buddhists as well as the Vēdāntins. All the Buddhist philosophers of

(1) Rashdall, o.c., p. 38.

(2) See Abhyankar, *Sarvadarśana Saṃgraha*, lines 30-33, p. 237.

(3) Siddhasena Divākara, o.c., Kārikas, 27-28.

(4) Keith thinks that Kaṇāda is a nickname; he thinks that the rise of the *Sūtras* is contemporaneous with that of the *Nyāya*. o.c., p. 483.

(5) Dutt, o.c., p. 310.

the succeeding age, beginning with Nāgārjuna, even including Hiuen Tsiang,¹ thought it worth their while to refute it, while it met with the most severe and crushing criticism at the hands of Śaṅkara, the great Vēdāntin.²

A system of philosophy, therefore, which aroused so much interest among the philosophers must have found a place in the curriculum of the then student.

Surveying, thus, the neo-Brāhmaṇic systems and their contributions to the old curricula, let us now revert to the consideration of Buddhist philosophy and its contribution to the student's curriculum.

In the opening centuries of the Christian era a revival had set in Buddhism, revival if we may use that term. For up till now the energy of the Buddhist monks was directed only to the propagation of the new faith. They were content to inculcate the obvious meaning of what Buddha said. But, in this period, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., we come across such distinguished writers as Nāgārjuna and Āryadēva, who discerned some deeper meaning in Buddha's preachings and founded or popularised a new form of Buddhism called Mahāyāna, and gave it a philosophy named *Mādhyamika*. The seeds of Mahāyāna may have been sown by the *Māhāsaṅghika* School in the 3rd century B. C., but the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna gained currency in the times of Nāgārjuna, that is to say, in the later half of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd centuries A.D.³

The causes of the inculcation of a new interpretation of Buddhism were some inherent defects in the old Buddhism, now called Hīnayāna, by the champions of new faith, perhaps, in contempt.

These defects according to its greatest expounder—Nāgārjuna—were not only philosophical but also religious.

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 161-164.

(2) Śaṅkara, o.c., adhyāya II, pāda 2, sūtras 11-17.

(3) Kimura, *Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna and Origin of Mahāyāna*, p. 11.

Though, he says that “the aim of Buddhism is only one, the destruction of suffering and attainment of *Nirvāṇa*, the Salvation, is of two kinds; one is for the self, the other not only for the self but for all creatures. Therefore, though both are equally claiming *Nirvāṇa* as their ideal, yet there is this difference that one claims it for the self and the other for all creatures. This makes difference in Buddhism.”¹ At another page we read a similar statement about the aims of *Hīnayāna* and *Mahāyāna*. There we are told that “the doctrine of *Mahāyāna* is full of mercy, while that of *Hīnayāna* is without mercy. Because the doctrine of *Mahāyāna* is for all creatures but that of *Hīnayāna* for the benefit of self only.”² The philosophical difference according to him was that “the doctrine of *Hīnayāna* preaches much of impermanence, while the doctrine of *Mahāyāna* preaches much of *Sūnyatā* of existence.”³ *Mahāyāna* threw open the doors of Salvation to all. This it did in the words of Waddell, “By developing the supernatural side of Buddhism and its objective symbolism, by rendering its salvation more accessible and universal and by substituting good words for the good deeds of the earlier Bodhisats;” also by “*Mahāyāna*’s idealisation of Buddha and his attributes which led to the creation of metaphysical Buddhas and celestial Bodhisats, actively willing and able to save, and to the introduction of innumerable demons and deities as objects of worship, with their attendant idolatry and sacerdotalism, both of which departures Buddha had expressly condemned.”⁴ Buddhism, thus, in its new guise fell in a line with other contemporary religions by the introduction of gods, goddesses and demons, though its “Buddha Theology was the greatest possible contradiction to the Agnostic Atheism.”⁵ In the work so often referred to above and in his other works, for

(1) *Prajñāpāramitāśāstra*. Wang Bundle, Vol. V., pp. 105 ab. referred to by Kimura, o.c., p. 164.

(2) 79th Fasciculi, o.c., *ibid.*, Vol. 4., p. 107b. Kimura, o.c., p. 163.

(3) 69th Fasciculi, o.c., *ibid.*, Vol. 4., p. 46-a.

(4) Waddell, *Lamaism*, pp. 11-12.

(5) Coomaraswami, o.c., p. 227.

instance, *Daśabhūmivibhāṣāśāstra*, Nāgārjuna, besides popularising his doctrines, attacks Brahmanical and Brahmanised systems such as *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga*.¹ Buddhism, thus resuscitated, in the sense that it was endowed with a philosophy which it formerly lacked, carried on the fight against the aforesaid systems and many others. Numerous works, refuting the Hīnayāna doctrines were written.

Āryadeva, another exponent of *Mādhyamika* philosophy and illustrious follower of Nāgārjuna, assailed *Sāṃkhya*, *Vaiśeṣika* and 20 other heretical schools in a work called "the explanation of *Nirvāṇa* by heretical and Hīnayāna Schools, mentioned in the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*".² Another of his works, *Śataśāstra* has been recently published by Tucci. In his introduction Tucci says,³ "It is a polemical work, the scope of which is to establish the exact doctrine of the Śūnya after refuting their views. The criticism is not only directed against Vaiśeṣika and the Sāṃkhyas but also against the various Hīnayāna Schools. Together with the works of Nāgārjuna this is one of the most important texts for the study of the mādhyamika doctrine. And in fact in China and Japan it was considered as one of the fundamental authorities by the school of the "three śāstras", so called because it based its teachings upon the *Mūlamādhyamikakārikā*, the *Dvālaśanikāyaśāstra* and our text".

Yet another doctrine was propounded in Buddhism by Maitreyanātha. While calling himself a Mahāyānist, he still disagreed from Nāgārjuna. Whereas the latter was a Nihilist out and out, believer in All-Void; the former maintained that objects had no real existence but in our mind; that only our

(1) Nāgārjuna's *Vigrahavyāvartanī* has been recently published by Tucci. See *Pre-Diinnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*, G. O. S., XLIX. In it, "Nāgārjuna explains the fundamental tenets of the Śūnyavāda refuting the objections raised against him by his opponents, heretics as well as Hīnayānists."

(2) Su. Bundle, Vol. 5, p. 58b, of *Chinese Tripitaka*; Kimura, o.c., p. 24.

(3) See Tucci, o.c., p. XIV.

ideas were real, everything else unreal. This doctrine is often called “Ālayavijñāna”, and popularly known as *Yogācāra*. Scholars were doubtful about the historicity of Maitreyanātha, but it is now proved from the colophon of *Abhisamayālāmīkārakārikā*, a commentary on *Pancavimśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* which is ascribed to Maitreyanātha.¹

The doctrine, however, found its complete evolution in the hands of Āśaṅga. In fact, he is regarded by many scholars as the author of the doctrine. It is possible, as Waddell thinks, that the pantheistic cult of *Yoga*, or the ecstatic union of the individual with the Universal spirit, and practices of abstract meditation and other mystical practices were grafted on the theistic Māhāyāna by Āśaṅga.² The principal works composed by him are :

- (1) *The Saṭṭa-daśa-bhūmi Śāstra*.
- (2) *The Mahāyāna-sūtra-upadeśa*.
- (3) *The Mahāyāna-saṃparigraha-śāstra*.

While Buddhism was thus developing on its philosophical side, the followers of other philosophical systems were not sitting idle. Vāṛṣaganya, Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Vindhya-vāsa,³ restated the *Sāṃkhya* doctrine, while Vātsāyana wrote commentaries on the *Nyāya Sūtras*. But in opposition to the *Sāṃkhya-Saṭṭati* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Vasubandhu composed the *Parmārtha Saṭṭati*, and destroyed his tenets and thus re-converted King Bālāditya (Narasimhagupta) from *Sāṃkhya* to Buddhism. Vasubandhu lived in A.D. 420-500.⁴ Besides the

(1) Kimura, o.c., p. 170.

(2) Waddell, o.c., pp. 13-14.

(3) Vindhya-vāsa was perhaps the same as Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the former being called so as he stayed in the Vindhya mountains. See Takakusu, Paramārtha's Life of Vasubandhu, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 47; also Keith, o.c., p. 488.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 47.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 47. Scholars are divided on Vasubandhu's date. Bhattacharyya, (*Tattvasaṅgraha*, G.O.S., XXX, foreword, p. LXVI) would like to place him in A.D., 280-360. Whereas Winternitz (*I. H. Q.*, March 1933, p. 5, n.) seems to be inclined to place him with Prof. Ui in A.D., 320-400.

work last mentioned he commented on the following Mahāyāna Sūtras :—

- (1) The *Avataṁsaka*.
- (2) The *Nirvāṇa*. (Nanjo's, 1206, 1207, 1209.)
- (3) The *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka*. (Nanjo's No. 1236, 1237.)
- (4) The *Prajñāpāramitā*. (Nanjo's No. 1231, 1168.)

Whereas the under-mentioned were compiled by him :—

- (1) The *Vijñāna-mātra-siddhi*. (Nanjo's Nos. 1215, 1238, 1168.)
- (2) The *Mahāyānasamāparigraharyākhyā*.
- (3) The *Nature of the Ratna Traya*.
- (4) The *Gate to the Nectar*.

His *Abhūdharmakośa*, represents his views on Mahāyāna.

Vasubandhu's contribution to Buddhist Logic, we shall speak of afterwards.

Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu, thus, made invaluable contribution to the development of Buddhist philosophy. They, it is possible, did all this, while residing at Nālandā. Both Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu, as Taranath tells us were great pandits of Nālandā.¹ We have mentioned them here in connection with the rise of the University of Nālandā, simply because they flourished in such a period, 420-500 A.D. that it is possible that they may have been doing all their work just when the University was being recognised officially, by King Śakrāditya (Kumāragupta I) who provided new *saṅghārāmas* for the lodging of students;² and that they went to Nālandā, when it had just come into existence.

These works, produced by Nāgārjuna, Āsaṅga, Vasubandhu and other lesser luminaries of Buddhism were primarily concerned with theology though tinged to no less a degree with philosophy.

(1) Taranath, *History of Buddhism*, p. 120.

(2) Hiuen T'siang, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*. Tr. by Beal, II., p. 168.

But we are told that Nālandā University was famous for the distinguished logicians that it possessed¹. Consequently, before we speak of Nālandā as a centre of pure Logic, let us pass through that transitional period, during which Logic was still mixed up with philosophy. This whole period has been admirably reviewed by Dr. Vidyabhusana, who says, "Buddhism spread as a faith about the 6th century B.C. But for a long time it remained a pure and simple religion. It was only in the 1st century A.D. that it had its first philosophy. By the time we come to the 4th century A.D. we find Buddhism expanding into four distinct philosophical Schools."² With philosophy had come Logic, but it lay dormant and played no prominent part.

Let us trace, then, the rise and growth of Logic, which in 500 A.D. was completely differentiated from general philosophy.

The real founders of the Mediaeval Logic were the Buddhists.³

The earliest reference to Logic and an explicit one, is to be found in *Milindapañha*, also known as the *Bhikṣusūtra* whose date is fixed at about 100 A.D.⁴ Next to this work, we have to start with the works of Nāgārjuna, as we did in our survey of Buddhist Philosophy. In his *Mādhyamika-kārikā*, which is the first work of the Mādhyamika Philosophy, he occasionally refers to certain technicalities of Logic, such as, the fallacy of the *Sādhyasama* (*pētitio principiū*) in Chapter IV.⁵ Other works : *Yukti-śastika-kārikā*, *Vigrahavyāvartanī-kārikā*, as their very names connote, establish with the help of Logic abstruse and subtle principles of Mādhyamika Philosophy.⁶

(1) See Vidyabhusana, o.c., Introduction, p. XXI.

(2) See Vidyabhusana, o.c., p. 78; cf. also *History of Indian Logic*, p. 270.

(3) *Ibid*, Introduction, p. XIX.

(4) *Ibid*, p. 61; *History of Indian Logic*, p. 240.

(5) Vidyabhusana, o.c., p. 70; *History of Indian Logic*, p. 256.

(6) Nāgārjuna's *Vigrahavyāvartanī* has been recently published by Tucci. See *Pre-Diññāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*,

In point of time, next to Nāgārjuna, comes Āryadeva. His works, too, show that the writer though a philosopher, was greatly influenced by Logic. His works are : *Śata-śāstra*, *Bhrama-pramathana-yukti-hetu-siddhi*, etc.¹

We have already referred to the philosophical works of Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu. Among the works composed by these eminent Buddhists Vasubandhus' *Tarka-śāstra* was, perhaps the first regular Buddhist work on Logic. In one of his works called 'Ronki' in the Chinese language, he maintained that a thesis could be proved by two propositions only, *viz.*, a proposition and a reason, and that, therefore, the necessary terms in a syllogistic inference are only three (*i.e.*, minor, major and the middle term).² Unfortunately, these works are lost, otherwise it would have been very instructive and interesting to compare the Buddhist syllogism, as formulated by Vasubandhu, with that of Aristotle. Because, as noted above, the syllogism as formulated by Vasubandhu is similar in many respects to that of Aristotle.

This brings us to Diññāga, the first systematic writer on Buddhist Logic, "the Father of Mediaeval Logic" as Dr. Vidyabhusana calls him.³ Of his contribution to this part of learning, we shall speak in the succeeding Chapters. For, according to one view, he lived at a time when the Nālandā University was already founded;⁴ and consequently his work must be viewed as of one of the pandits of Nālandā.

. O. S., XLIX. Tucci says, "Vigrahavyāvartanī has a great bearing upon the history of Indian Logic, since it embodies the criticism of āgārjuna relating to the theory of Pramāṇas." *Ibid.*, Preface, II.

(1) See above, p. 18. Tucci has published a *Tarkaśāstra* (*see Ibid.*) and he says, "This text has been attributed by some authors of the Chinese canon to Vasubandhu", and though "there are many similarities between this text and *Vādavidhi*", "still there is no definite argument to support the view."

(2) Vidyabhusana, o.c., p. 73-77; also *H. I. L.*, p. 268.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 78; *Ibid.*, p. 270.

(4) According to Vidyabhusana, *History of Indian Logic*, p. 273 Diññāga lived in 500 A.D., Keith, o.c., p. 484, says that he lived probably before 400 A.D.

It would be, therefore, right to say that Buddhist Logic and Philosophy wonderfully enriched the old curriculum of the early Christian era. Instead of the *Vēdas*, etc., the student could find something totally new in this revised curriculum. Probably it was because of this reason that students in later times flocked in great numbers to the Buddhist institutions.

Having, thus, surveyed the landmarks in the history of Indian education, we can say that the time was quite ripe for the rise of a University. And it was just at this opportune moment that the University of Nālandā was founded. For, as we have already seen, Indian thought had then reached its culminating point. Almost all the most important and greatest religions and philosophies of India, which really formed the backbone of the ancient Indian education had been propounded and popularised. And no Indian religion and philosophy worth the name have been preached after the rise of Nālandā save perhaps the *Kerālādvaita* of Śaṅkara, *Suddhādvaita* of Vallabha and *Viśiṣṭādvaita* of Rāmānuja and others. Even these philosophies drew their inspiration from the *Upaniṣads* and the *Brahma Sūtras* which are, in fact, a critical survey of the then existing philosophies.

The University of Nālandā, then, had inherited a very rich legacy from the past. The Chapters that follow will show us how it enriched and bestowed this wonderful legacy upon the future.

CHAPTER II

PART II

THE BACKGROUND OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NĀLANDĀ; TRANSFORMATION OF 'SAṄGHĀRĀMAS' INTO TEMPLES OF LEARNING

IN Part I of this Chapter we saw that circumstances were favourable for the rise of a University. In this Part we have to see how a Buddhist *vihāra* came to be a University. For Nālandā, though a University was, nevertheless, a monastery. And the question naturally asked is: How could a monastery be a centre of learning? For a proper understanding of this question we must, needs, first, know what a Buddhist monastery was, and how it came into existence.

In Sanskrit, a monastery is called a "saṅghārāma"¹. Sometimes the word "vihāra" is also used in the same sense. Now, by a "saṅghārāma" or a "vihāra" we understand a place where *Bhikkhus* [-] generally Buddhists [-] lived. "Ārāmas" i.e., parks were usually the places where Buddha put up with his disciples.² The resting place, where the *saṅgha* stayed, therefore, came to be called a "saṅghārāma".³ These *Bhikkhus* had renounced the world; they were mendicants; their sole purpose in life was to practise and to propagate the religion of Buddha. To India such religious mendicants were not a novel thing. She had them in her R̥sis of the Vēdic and the Upaniṣadic times, in her *Brahmacārins*, and *Sanyāsins*. It was only the goal which differentiated the Buddhist *Bhikkhus* from the R̥sis and others.

(1) See Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 168.

(2) Jetāvana at Śrāvasti, Veluvana at Rājagṛha, Isipatana at Benares were favourite resorts of Buddha. See *Mahāvagga*, VI, 22, 1, 20, 1 and 23, 1 respectively.

(3) An 'ārāma' it appears from the *Vinaya Texts* connoted a resting place.

Cf. the following: "Anātha Piṇḍika told the Kumāra, 'Sir, let me have your garden to make an Ārāma on it', and then constructed a building over it for Buddha and his followers." *Cullavagga*, VI, 4, 9—10.

The object of the latter was to acquire knowledge for themselves. The Buddhist *Bhikkhus* in later times possessed almost similar characteristics, when they resided in monasteries and busied themselves in their studies, instead of wandering from place to place.

Now Buddhist monachism owes its origin to the Buddhist *Saṅgha*. And Buddhist *Saṅgha* has a history of its own.

In the sixth century B.C., when Gotama, the Śākyā Prince returned enlightened to this world there existed many wandering religious *saṅghas*. The one that is often spoken of in the *Vinaya Texts* was called *Saṅgha* of *Titthiya* Schools.¹ The Buddhist *Bhikkhus* were known as Śākyaputtiya *Samanas*. The Buddhist *Saṅgha* was, perhaps, moulded on this existing one. Especially, the one feature, *viz.*, the rain-retreat which afterwards led to the foundation of monasteries seems to have been borrowed from this School. For we are told in *Mahāvagga* that *Bhikkhus* went on their travels alike during winter, summer and the rainy season. Because the retreat during the rainy season had not yet been instituted by the Blessed One.² The story how Buddha happened to prescribe the rain-retreat is very interesting. The ascetics of the *Titthiya* School observed the rain-retreat, while the Buddhist *Bhikkhus* did not. The people began murmuring that the Buddhist *Bhikkhus* by wandering even in the monsoon, crushed the green herbs and destroyed vegetable and many other small lives. The complaint was reported to Buddha. Since, then, Buddha prescribed that the *Bhikkhus* should enter upon the *Vassā*.³ Buddha-*ghoṣa*, the commentator upon the *Vinaya Texts* tells us how this ceremony was gone through. "They are to look after their *Vihāra*," says he, "to provide food and water for themselves, to fulfil all due ceremonies, such as paying reverence to sacred shrines, etc., and to say loudly once, or twice, or thrice: 'I enter upon *Vassā* in this *Vihāra* for three months.' Thus

(1) *Mahāvagga*, II, 1-2.

(2) *Ibid.*, III, 1.

(3) *Ibid.*, III, 1.

they are to enter upon *Vassā*.¹ In this custom of staying at one fixed place, we find the seeds of the future *Saṅghārāmas* and *vihāras*.

We shall here deal only with the growth of the *vihāras*, etc., leaving aside the various rules and regulations, ceremonies and observances relating to the *vihāras* and their inmates.

The resort to the *vihāras* was only during the rainy season. Otherwise the *Bhikkhus* had no dwelling places. They lived in the woods, at the foot of trees, and on hill sides. But we learn from *Cullavagga* that Buddha afterwards at the request of the *Setthi* (a rich merchant) of Rājagṛha allowed the following abodes: *vihāra*, *addhāyogas* (these are explained as gold-coloured Bengal houses), storied dwellings, attics, and caves.² Whether Buddha allowed so many abodes only during the rain-retreats or in other seasons also is not quite clear from the reading of the text. But if Buddha permitted the use of these dwellings during other seasons, it must, we think, be for a very short period. For even though the dwelling places had come into existence, it must have taken a pretty long time to give a complete go-bye to the ideal of eremitical life. Some centuries must have elapsed before the *āvāsas* came to be organised and had a distinct existence.

We cannot say definitely when this ideal was given up, but a beginning was made during the lifetime of Buddha himself. Dutt's conclusions are founded on certain rules of *Cullavagga*³ which deal with the allotment of *senāsanas* (seats) in an *āvāsa*. The general rule is that the seats are to be retained during the period of the *Vassā*. "In accordance with this rule, there are two regular occasions for the allotment of seats, the commencement of the earlier and that of the later *Vassā*." Continuing, Dutt says, "Curiously enough, a third, viz., the day after the *Pavarana*, called *Autara muttaka*, is re-

(1) *Ibid.*, n.

(2) *Cullavagga*, VI, 1-2.

(3) Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 130.

cognised when seats are allotted for the next rain-retreat in anticipation. This *Autara muttaka* allotment would be quite superfluous, if residence at a monastery were really limited to the period of the rain-retreat. The *āvāsas*, from being shelters during the rain-retreat, became places of domicile, and hence seats had to be allotted not only for three or four months of the year, but also for the remaining period. The modification of the wandering habit of the monks necessitated the second rule. The fiction, however, *viz.*, that *āvāsas* were only for the rain-retreat and nothing more and that the *Bhikkhus* should be homeless beyond that period, is piously kept up. The allotment which is really made for the non-*Vassā* period is said to be made in advance for the next *Vassā* period, which is absurd, considering that, for that period, another allotment is provided for.”¹

The purpose of the *vihāras* and other dwelling places in the words of Buddha was this : “To give *vihāras* to the *Sāṅgha*, where, in safety and in peace, to meditate and think at ease, the Buddha calls the best of gifts. Let then the able man, regarding his own weal, have pleasant monasteries built, and lodge their learned men.”²

The vision of Buddha indeed came true. People carried out to the letter the wish of Buddha. Kings, wealthy merchants and even common people constructed *vihāras* and carved out monasteries in mountains. The *viharas* of Nālandā, and Vikramaśilā, and the caves at Ellora, Kārlā, and Nāsik and specially Kanheri,³ are living examples of the fact. A small inscription on a pillar in the *chaitya* cave at Kāriā says that the expenses of its construction were given by a particular person. From this, it appears that where a *vihāra* could not be built with the financial help of one person; many persons combined together, each donating something to the building

(1) Dutt, o.c. p. 130.

(2) *Cullavagga*, VI, 1, 5.

(3) From the construction of many of the caves at Kanheri, it appears that in the earliest caves barest necessities of the *Bhikkhus* were kept in view, *viz.*, a tolerably small cell with provision for sleeping.

fund of the project. Hence we said above that even common people built *vihāras*. Some of these *vihāras*, as we know, became famous centres of learning and abodes of distinguished professors.

Buddha, we learn from *Vinaya Texts*, had no particular *vihāra* of his own. He usually put up in an *ārāma* of some "Setthi", i.e., rich merchant, or sometimes in the *ārāmas* of King Bimbisāra. We have observed that Buddha permitted the use of *vihāras*, *addhāyogas*, storied dwellings, attics and caves.¹ If some were to think that these abodes, meant as they were for the use of *Bhikkhus*, must be nothing more than a hut, there can be no greater misconception of the Buddhist habitations. Buddha, we shall see in a future Chapter, was very liberal in his views as regards dress, etc. He even allowed the use of silk robes. In the case of *vihāras* and *Saṅghārāmas*, the same broad-mindedness and reforming zeal are visible. Instead of huts of Puritan simplicity, we find descriptions of *vihāras* in *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*, which simply astound us. The *vihāras* were full-fledged houses. Verandah, covered terraces, inner verandhas, overhanging eaves, store-rooms, and service halls gradually came to be built as the number of *Bhikkhus* increased.² Furniture was also luxurious; cushions, chairs, armchairs, sofas, bedsteads, all were there, provided they were given as a gift to the *Saṅgha*, or provided they became the property of the *saṅgha* without being paid anything for them.³ Even, so early as *Pattimokkha* which was, perhaps, the earliest Buddhist compendium of *Vinaya* rules,⁴ a bedstead, chair, mat, stool, etc., formed the furniture of the cell of a *vihāra*.⁵ There was a ceiling usually of cloth, which prevented any dust or serpent, etc., from falling from the roof.⁶ Another fact which leads us to conclude that *vihāras* were

(1) *Cullavagga*, VI. 1-2.

(2) *Ibid.*, VI, 3, 5, 6.

(3) *Ibid.*, VI.

(4) Introduction to the *Vinaya Texts* from Pali, *S.B.E.*, XII., p. IX.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 34.

(6) *Cullavagga*, VI, 3, 4.

much better, more spacious, and better decorated than the *Rṣiāśramas* is that the walls of *vihāras* were coloured red, and white washed, while the floor was coloured black.¹ Roofs of *vihāras* were usually made of brick, stone and cement.² That is to say, they were just like terraces. It we are told that straw also was used for preparing the roof, we think, that it must be for some temporary structures. Anātha Piṇḍika's description of an *ārāma*, i.e., *Saṅghārāma* in *Cullavagga*³ will stand comparison with any college of to-day.

Originally the *ārāmas* had no fence. But, afterwards the Blessed One allowed the *Bhikkhus* to have a fence made of bamboo-sticks, thorns or a ditch⁴. But once the thin edge of the wedge was in, the *Bhikkhus* pressed on their demands still further. As the *vihāras* became permanent places of residence, the want of *Bhikkhus* increased. To protect these rich *vihāras*, as they had now become, containing provisions not for a day but for months, they were fenced round by a wood, brick, or a stone-wall,⁵ as we find in the case of Nālandā⁶ and the Odantapuri *Vihāras*.

We have seen how *vihāras* and *Saṅghārāmas* sprung up. We are told *vihāras* were built for mainly two purposes.⁷ First, that the Buddhist *Saṅgha* may meditate in peace and safety. Second, that learned men may lodge in the *vihāras*. Gradually, however, the second object became the only object. As *vihāras* became repositories of learned men, they began to attract students from various parts of the land whose sole object was the acquisition of knowledge.

Before we go to trace the change that was brought about in the nature of monasteries, let us see what were the functions

(1) *Ibid.*, VI, 3, 1.

(2) *Ibid.*, VI, 3, 10.

(3) *Ibid.*, VI, 4, 10.

(4) *Ibid.*, VI, 3, 10.

(5) *Ibid.*, VI, 3, 8.

(6) See Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, 170.

(7) *Cullavagga*, VI, 1, 5.

of the Buddhist *Saṅgha*, which also underwent a transformation, along with a change in the nature of monasteries.

Apart from meditation, the Buddhist *Saṅgha* had certain other ceremonies to perform, in accordance with the rules laid down by Buddha.¹ They,—the *Bhikkhus*—met on the 8th, 14th and 15th of the month to recite Dhamma.² Then they also met to perform the *Uposatha* ceremony. But the most common meeting of the *Bhikkhus* was for admission of guilt that was committed by a *Bhikkhu* or *Bhikkhus*, since their last meeting. For all these ceremonies, Buddha had laid down certain rules. *Uposatha* could only be performed by the complete fraternity of the *Bhikkhus*.³ Again, it could be performed in a *vihāra*, a cave, or a house, but not in successive cells of the *Bhikkhus*.⁴ Another of Buddha's regulation was that for every official act to be done by the *saṅgha*, consent of all the *Bhikkhus* was necessary, so much so that, even a sick *Bhikkhu* was asked to declare his views, while seeing his *pariśuddhi*, i.e., his purity.⁵

Now, for performing all these ceremonies, for the recital of *Patimokkha*, for performing *Uposatha* ceremony, and even for putting questions about *Vinaya*, a *Bhikkhu* was to be appointed a president for the purpose, by the *saṅgha* or by himself.⁶ Only a competent *Bhikkhu* was made a president. Apart from the president of the *Saṅgha*, Buddha had fixed a certain number of *Bhikkhus* with whose help the official act, called “*Saṅghakāmma*” could be done. The minimum for such an act was fixed at four.⁷ Moreover, the act was to be done in the manner prescribed. There was first, what is called “*Natti*”, i.e., resolution or proposal of the resolution; second,

(1) *Mahāvagga*, IX.

(2) Some of the ceremonies, as *Upasampāda*, etc., were still in vogue when I-Tsing was at Nālandā. See I-Tsing, o.c., p. 103.

(3) *Mahāvagga*, II, 5, 2.

(4) *Ibid.*, II, 8, 1.

(5) *Ibid.*, II, 2, 2-3.

(6) *Ibid.*, II, 15, 6.

(7) *Ibid.*, II, 26, 1.

“*Anusavanna*”, i.e., proclamation of the proposed act ; third, consent of the members expressed by their silence. The *Vinaya Texts*, besides these, give many more details, for example, the procedure when there would be a difference of opinion, etc. Since it would take us into unnecessary details, we have refrained from going further into the matter.

The Buddhist *Saṅgha*, it would thus appear, to put into modern phraseology, with its president and assembly was something like a “ Republican Church Government.”¹ There was never a supreme head like an abbot, so far as the early history of the *Saṅgha* goes.

A change, however, was coming over the monasteries. For, when we come to Nālandā in the 5th century and Vikramaśilā in the 10th century, we learn that Śīlabhadra² and Atīśa were the abbots of these Universities. But this departure from the express order of Buddha³ was perhaps due to another change that had come over the monasteries. This we have referred to previously. Monasteries were now no more shelters for *Bhikkhus* to pass their life by meditating on the teachings of Buddha. With the reformation that sprung up in the Buddhist religious and philosophical principles in the shape of *Śūnyavāda*, etc., in the centuries that followed the death of Buddha, more particularly in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Christian era, the pursuit of secular knowledge (which was almost repugnant to the very purpose and spirit of Buddhism) became, an ideal of the monasteries, which erstwhile stood primarily for the purpose of propagating Buddhism. “Buddhist institutions,” as Keay puts it,⁴ “did become to some extent places of general learning.” This is quite evident from the records of the Chinese pilgrims, and from the curriculum of the Buddhist

(1) Dutt, o.c. p. 137.

(2) See Hwui Li, o.c. p. 112.

(3) Note that Buddha had said, “Be ye lamps unto yourselves. Be a refuge to yourselves. Betake yourselves to no external refuge” Tr. by Rhys David. reference taken from Dutt, o.c. p. 142.

(4) *Ancient Indian Education*, p. 94.

institutions like Nālandā and others. I-Tsing,¹ for instance, is quite explicit on this point, when he says, "Those white-robed (laymen) who come to the residence of a priest, and read chiefly Buddhist scriptures with the intention that they may become one day tonsured and black-robed, are called 'children' (*Mānava*). Those who (coming to a priest) want to learn secular literature only, without having any intention of quitting the world, are called 'students' (*Brahmacārin*). These two groups of persons (though residing in a monastery) have to subsist at their own expense." Since the monasteries were being converted into educational institutions, a person who would be the head or the abbot thereof was absolutely necessary to control the students.

It is interesting to compare the changes which the monasteries of Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries underwent with those of pre-Christian and post-Christian India. Both in Europe as well as India monasteries had become Temples of Learning. But, whereas in Europe, educational activity passed out from the hands of the monks to those of secular clergy, with the spread of knowledge in the outside world, in India the monks were a little fortunate in retaining it. They saw, as we noticed above, what was coming, and they responded to the growing need. Therefore, instead of being swept away totally by the on-coming wave of reforms, they deemed it wiser to relax the rules of their order. The doors of the Buddhist *Saṅgha* which were open before only to those who had forsaken the world, were now thrown open to the students as well, who, if they chose, were at liberty to leave the monastery and embrace once more the life of a householder, after their education was over. It is in this transformation of the monasteries that we find the seeds of the University of Nālandā.

CHAPTER III

THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS GROWTH UNDER KINGS OF VARIOUS DYNASTIES

A marked feature of Indian history is the immense number of traditional and legendary accounts. Kings, of however small and insignificant a place, claim their descent from some supernatural agency, usually the Sun or the Moon. As with kings, so with places. They also have their theory of divine or supernatural origin. It is not we, moderns, that are struck with these accounts. Even the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang was so much surprised with the name Nālandā, that in the very beginning of his account of the place, he discusses the various theories as to the origin of the name, leaving aside its other more attractive features. He says, "Going north from this, 30 li or so, we come to Nālandā *saṅghārāma*. The old accounts of the country say that to the south of this *saṅghārāma*, in the middle of an *Āmra* (mango) grove, there is a tank. The Nāga of this tank is called Nālandā. By the side of it is built the *saṅghārāma*, which therefore takes the name of the Nāga."¹

Here ends the one legendary account of the place. Proceeding to give the second account, which he thinks to be the true one, he says, "But the truth is that Tathāgata in old days practised the life of a Bodhisattva here and became the King of a great country and established his capital in the land. Moved by pity for living things, he delighted in continually relieving them. In remembrance of this virtue he was called 'charity without intermission,' and the *saṅghārāma* was called in perpetuation of his name."²

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 167.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168.

The reason why Hiuen Tsiang considers the latter account as true can be easily explained. He was a devout Buddhist. And when he wrote this account he only voiced the feelings of the Buddhists who had invented a legend to explain the name Nālandā. The story sounds like one of the *Jātaka* tales which describe the previous lives of Buddha. We cannot, however, place credence in this explanation, for the simple reason that even when Buddha was alive, the place was called by that name.¹

Let us now examine the first account. I-Tsing, another Chinese traveller who visited India after Hiuen Tsiang, thinks that Nālandā derived its name from the Nāga Nanda.² We cannot understand why the travellers should disagree regarding the name of the Nāga. We think I-Tsing is giving the original name of the Nāga, whereas Hiuen Tsiang gives the name which Nāga came to acquire afterwards. For we often say, "He is from this place or this is from such and such a place." The Nāga, therefore, must have in course of time come to be called 'the Nāga of Nālandā' which gradually must have been shortened into 'Nāga Nālandā' or 'Nālandā Nāga.' But this discussion does not lead us anywhere. At least it does not tell us how the place came to be called Nālandā, though incidentally we have suggested a theory as to the name of the Nāga.

That there was a mango grove, a tank and perhaps the Nāga too, is beyond doubt. For Buddha in his tours always stayed under a grove of trees and Nālandā must have also one. As to the tank, etc., we have the testimony of General Cunningham who, examined the place and carried on some excavations there in the later part of the last century, says, "There is still existing immediately to the south of the ruined monastery a small tank called Kargidya Pokhar, which exactly

(1) See *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* in the *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II, pp. 87-89: where Buddha says, "Come Ananda, let us go to Nālandā."

(2) Takakusu, *J. R. A. S.*, N. S., XIII, p. 571.

answers to the position of Nālandā tank and is the identical part of the Nāga.”¹

To resume the history of the name Nālandā. Prof. Beal has put forward one etymological analysis of the name suggested by Hiuen Tsiang’s interpretation.² In a footnote on the phrase ‘charity without intermission’, he says, “The word Nālandā would thus appear to be derived from *Na-alam-dā*, not giving enough,” or not having enough to give. But this interpretation rather goes against the one given by the traveller though it is quite correct literally. If, however, we take ‘*na-alam-dā*’ as an interrogative sentence, requiring a positive or affirmative reply: *alam dātum* (for *dā*), *viz.*, that there is sufficient to give, we can say that the phrase *na-alam-dātum* (for *dā*) though negative, emphatically brings out a positive reply that (the place) was (rich) enough to provide (for all). The position of ‘*na*’ in the sentence *alam-dātum na* is not so much objectionable because it can as well be put in the front: *na-alam-dātum*, because in Sanskrit the position of words does not matter so much as the sense is conveyed by the emphasis put on the words, which in the present case would naturally be put on the word *na*.

In short the name conveyed the idea that the place was rich and prosperous.

The early history of the place bears sufficient testimony to its claim to be a rich and prosperous city. Various Buddhist texts tell us that the place in the days of Buddha was a prosperous village.³ To take but one illustration. It is stated that Lepa, one of the citizens of Nālandā, was prosperous, famous, rich and had large houses, beds, seats, vehicles and chariots, abounding in riches, gold and silver, possessed of useful and necessary things, owning many male and female slaves, cows, buffaloes, and sheep.⁴ Even the Great Buddha had partaken

(1) *A. S. R.*, I, p. 30.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, 168.

(3) *Sum. Vil.*, p. 35; *Majjh. Nik.*, I, p. 377; *Digh. Nik.*, I, Sutta 11.

(4) *Sūtrakṛitaṅga*, *S. B. E.*, XLV, p. 420.

of Lepa's hospitality. Lepa offered his rich bathing halls to the Enlightened Śākyā prince, who gladly accepted them and delivered a long discourse which had the effect of converting him to Buddhism. *Sūtrakritiṅga* also tells us that Nālandā contained many hundreds of buildings.¹

We have dismissed Hiuen Tsiang's theory because it reminded us of many of the *Jātaka* tales which are pure inventions of the devout Buddhists. But if we eschew the mythical portion (*viz.* that which refers to the previous life of Buddha as a great king who gave to all in charity without intermission) and keep in mind that Nālandā was a rich place, as has been proved by its past history then we say that Nālandā derived its name because of its hospitality and charity.²

To resume the early history of Nālandā. Nālandā before it became an educational centre, had already been imbued with the holy memories of Buddha. Even before Buddha it was the place where the Great Mahāvīra met Gosāla.³ Among the many places where Buddha carried on his religious propaganda Nālandā held a unique position. Many a time with his favourite disciple Ānanda, he had visited the place and stayed at the Pāvārika mango-grove.⁴ And this Ānanda thought that Nālandā was a fit place for Buddha's *Nirvāṇa* and not Pātali-

(1) o.c., p. 420.

(2) Hira Nand Shastri has hazarded still another explanation. He says, "In view of the fact (that) the locality abounds with lotuses even now, it does not appear to be improbable that it was so named because it gave lotuses or *nalas* or lotur flowers, as well as scholars by *dhvani* or implication of course, in later ages." But it is a conjecture as he himself admits it. *Proceedings, Fifth Indian Oriental Conference*, I, p. 387.

(3) According to Jain Works Nālandā was a suburb or *bahirika* of Rājagrha in the time of Mahāvīra who as stated therein spent fourteen rainy seasons in all.

It is interesting to note that another Jain Work *Sametasikhara Tīrthamālā*, of not very great antiquity, testifies to the above description of Nālandā, and further gives the name by which it was known at the time of its composition *viz.*, Burgaon—and by which it is still called by the people of the locality. See *Ibid.*, pp. 389 to 392.

Bhagavatī Sūtra, referred to by N. Dutt, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools*, p. 125.

(4) *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta*, o.c., pp. 87 and 89.

putra. From this Samaddar concludes, "So far as importance went Nālandā was superior to Pātaliputra, and it may be therefore taken for granted that Nālandā was older than Pātaliputra."¹ We know nothing about Nālandā from this period, that is to say after Buddha's *Nirvāṇa* which took place in 483 B.C.,² down to the seventh century A.D., when Hiuen Tsiang visited India and recorded his account of Nālandā. It is only Taranath, who wrote the *History of Buddhism* in about 1500 A.D. that enables us to know what happened in the centuries that followed the death of Buddha. He observes, "Here in Nālandā was in former times, the birthplace of the venerable Śāriputta and it is also the place, where he with 80,000 *arhats* attained *Nirvāṇa*. In course of time, only the *chaitya* of the venerable Śāriputta remained at which King Aśoka gave great offerings to the gods and to which he erected a great Buddhist temple. In this way the first founder of the Nālandā *Vihāra* was Aśoka."³ Thus antiquity, glamour and sacredness claimed by all ancient things are claimed for the Nālandā University by attributing its rise to Aśoka.

To know something about Nālandā after Christ, before we come to the historical part, we have again to refer to Taranath. But, he too mentions a tradition according to which Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva (c. 100 A.D.) were the forerunners among those who took interest in the educational institutions of the place.

Yet to mention another tradition given by Taranath. Suviṣṇu, a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, is said to have established 108 temples at Nālandā in order to prevent any decline of *Abhidhamma*.⁴ Since the tradition mentions Nāgārjuna it cannot be older than the 2nd century A.D.

The probability of this tradition we shall discuss after referring to Fa-hien, who toured India in the early years of

(1) Samaddar, *Glories of Magadha*, p. 126.

(2) Coomaraswami, o.c., p. 9.

(3) Taranath, *History of Buddhism in India*, p. 72.

(4) *Ibid.*

the fifth century A. D. Now he does not mention Nālandā. But he says, "A Yojana south-west from this place brought them to the village of Nala, where Śāriputra was born, and to which also he returned and attained here his *Pari-nirvāṇa*. Over the spot there was built a *topa*,¹ which is still in existence."² Fa-hien, though does not mention Nālandā, his description of the place exactly tallies with the description gathered from other sources and the question arises whether he speaks of Nālandā or some other place near it.

Now this Nala was one *yojana*, i.e., seven miles from Giryek (old Rājagṛha) and the same distance from the new Rājagṛha; and as Nālandā was also one *yojana* from Rājagṛha one is tempted to identify Nala with Nālandā. But we learn from Fa-hien himself that Nala was the place where Śāriputra was born and had died. And it appears that this Nala was no other than Nālaka, where according to *Sudassana Jātaka*,³ Śāriputra was born. It is thus clear that Fa-hien's Nala was not Nālandā as alleged, but Nālaka, an unimportant village, *nalagrāma*, as the *Jātaka* expressly calls it. From this it follows that because Fa-hien did not visit Nālandā, he did not give us a good account of the place. And the reason why he does not give the correct name of Nālandā, was that he did not visit Nālandā at all. For had he really visited it, we are unable to understand, why he should not give us the correct name of Nālandā, when the place was known for centuries after Buddha by that name. Why do not Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing make any mistake in giving the correct name of the place? It cannot be said that Nālandā had become so insignificant that it had lost its original name when Fa-hien visited it and that it again recovered its original name when Śakrāditya and his suit happened to see it and think of building monasteries there. On the contrary, the very fact that Śakrāditya (Kumāragupta I) thought of

(1) 'Topa' is a Singalese word for 'Stupa'.

(2) Fa-hien, *A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms*, Trans. by Legge, p. 81.

(3) *S.B.E.*, XI, p. 238.

erecting *sanghārāmās* at Nālandā speaks in favour of Nālandā. The great temple by Aśoka, and other smaller ones by Brāhmaṇa Suviṣṇu, and the fact that in Nālandā Buddha had passed many happy days in the vast and rich house of Lepa—all these—must have attracted Śakrāditya to Nālandā. We cannot therefore, agree with those scholars who say that the tradition of Suviṣṇu building 108 temples is not authentic, because Fa-hien who visited India for the first time in 404 A.D., calls it simply the village of Nala.¹ For, as we have already shown, the village visited by Fa-hien was probably Nālaka and not Nālandā. To the objection that Nālandā, if it was famous when Fa-hien toured through Magadha, containing as it did 108 temples and a great temple of Aśoka, why should not Fa-hien mention them, we reply that the argument from silence is no objection. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador to Chandragupta's court, for instance, shows such surprising ignorance about the Mauryan India that if we were to believe in him we shall have to unlearn much of what we know of that period.

While reading the account of Fa-hien's and Hiuen Tsiang's travels in India we should note one point. It is this: Fa-hien's accounts of the places visited are often quite sketchy and brief. Many of his narratives contain nothing but what he heard, and only reveal his love for repeating the legends. While describing Patna he mentions some Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna monasteries. With the exception of general remarks about its appearance, etc., how brief is his description!² Hiuen Tsiang, unlike his predecessor seems to note down whatever he sees, apart from what he gathers from hearsay. He gives a detailed and minute description of King Pulakeśi II and his people.³ It may be that Fa-hien had not the same opportunities as Hiuen Tsiang had, partly because he was the first traveller from China and

(1) See Kimura, for instance, *Shifting of the Centre of Buddhism in India*, *J.D.L.*, *Cal. Uni.*, I, p. 36.

(2) Fa-hien, o.c., p. 78.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, pp. 255-257.

partly because his stay in India was very short and his tour not so comprehensive as his successors.

With due deference to the various scholars who based their conclusions on Fa-hien's silence about Nālandā, we submit that it is no use all the time jumping to the conclusion that the tradition is wrong, or the things did not exist because Fa-hien or anybody else did not tell us what we expected him to tell us. Probably he did not see the things.

By this time it must have been apparent that Nālandā possessed some points in its favour which would make it a suitable place for the foundation of a Buddhist University.

To sum up these points:

Nālandā was often visited by Buddha and his disciples and many discussions were held here with other religious sects.¹

Here the great Mahāvira, the Jain Tīrthaṅkara met Gosāla.²

So the place long before the Christian era was noted as a great religious centre. And it continued to enjoy this fame even in the centuries after the advent of Christianity, because, as we have said previously, the place, where all the philosophical discussions between Nāgārjuna and others were carried on, was Nālandā.

Long before Śakrāditya, Aśoka had chosen this place for building a temple and a *vihāra*. Moreover, Nālandā was very near, not more than 7 miles, from Rājagrha, the capital of Magadha in the time of Jarāsandha and his successors, and afterwards the centre of Buddha's religious activities. This small distance from Rājagrha was, we think of great importance. Precisely because it was a little distant from Rājagrha that the monasteries were built there. For the *Bhikkhus* and the *Brahmacārins* alike lived in places which were a little away from very thickly populated places, and yet not so far away that they were not within very easy reach. Even the modern

(1) N. Dutt, o.c., p. 125.

(2) *Ibid.*

colleges are built on the same principle. In short, there must be facility of access and that, we think, Nālandā afforded sufficiently.

Other recommendations, cheapness, abundance of food stuffs, etc., Nālandā did possess. Many of its inhabitants had sung to Buddha of the prosperity of Nālandā.

The climate of Nālandā, we learn from I-Tsing, was very hot.¹ And the one advantage of this was that the *Bhikkhus* did not require many garments.² But even apart from this advantage, Nālandā, or as a matter of fact any place in Magadha, could not but be hot as Maghada itself is situated in the hot regions of India.

These are some of the reasons why Nālandā of all places in Maghada became a great seat of a University.

In the preceding Chapter while speaking about the history of Buddhist monachism, we have seen how the *Bhikkhus* came to stay in permanent places, how these places called *saṅghārāmas* diffused knowledge in various branches of learning, religious as well as secular, how in course of time they came to be the resorts of *Bhikkhus* and *Brahmacārins* alike.

Hiuen Tsiang tells us how exactly the *saṅghārāmas* at Nālandā passed through all these stages and gradually developed in a residential University. Speaking of one particular *saṅghārāma* he says, "A former king of this country named Śakrāditya. built this *saṅghārāma*."³

And this *saṅghārāma* founded by Śakrāditya (afterwards identified with Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Guptas) was to be a residential University, and not a shelter for *Bhikkhus* to resort to for merely religious purposes. If any evidence be needed for this interpretation, it can be found in the words of the

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 70.

(2) This advantage, however, could be had in summer only. For Nālandā is pretty cold in winter and gets sufficient rain too.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, 168. These *saṅghārāmas* may very well be called "monastic schools" such as were found in Mediaeval Europe in Bologna and Paris, though their respective Universities were not the outcome of monastic schools. See Rashdall, o.c., p. 276 ff.

soothsayer.¹ They were elicited on account of the following circumstances. The King Śakrāditya when he had selected a lucky spot in an auspicious moment, and when the work for digging up the place for laying the foundation was going on, the Nāgā (evidently the Nāga of Nālandā) was wounded. To an Indian king, whether he be a Hindu or Buddhist, this is a sign of ill-omen, for reptiles of all kinds he held sacred, and specially among them, the Nāga or a cobra. The king perhaps must have consulted the soothsayer in order to know whether to proceed with the work or not. And what the soothsayer predicted really came true. He told the king, "This is a very superior site, if you build here a *saṅghārāma*, it must of necessity become highly renowned. Throughout the five Indies it will be a model. For a period of thousand years it will flourish still. Students of all degrees will, here, easily accomplish their studies. But many will spil blood because of this wound given to the Nāga."² His last words clearly show that he was no flatterer. He declared in clear, unequivocal terms what he thought to be the future of the University whose foundation stone the king was then laying down. Nālandā was to be a centre of learning of international repute. Nālandā was to be a battle-field where two faiths, opposite in character, were to contend against each other and destroy many a young scholar.

The genuineness of the prophecy cannot be doubted. No interpolation has yet been found in the records of Hiuen Tsiang, and so it cannot be said that the passage in question was afterwards interpolated. Even there has been no such suggestion. Consequently the present passage is quite free from the charge of interpolation so often brought against such prophetic legends. The only questions then that remain are: whether the prophecy was made after Nālandā had already become famous as a "*studium generale*"; secondly, whether the prophecy was made after the buildings had already been destroyed, at least once, by the savage bands of Mihirakula.

(1) See Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II., p. 168.

(2) *Ibid.*

Nālandā had seen ups and downs in its career so many times that the prophecy could be true not only of its whole history but also of the various period of its history considered separately.

Nālandā, no sooner it was founded by Śakrāditya and extended by his son Buddhagupta-rājā and his successor Tathāgatagupta-rājā, than was destroyed by Mihirakula.¹ It stands to reason that Nālandā, as it was built by Śakrāditya must have come into great prominence as an educational centre, otherwise his son and successors would not have expended their energy over institutions that were not prospering. On the contrary, the fact that they went on adding more colleges to the existing ones points to another fact that they responded to the growing need of greater accommodation for the ever increasing number of students. We have, thus, shown that the one period of the history of Nālandā exactly fits in with the first part of the prophecy. As to the second part, *viz.*, "much blood will be spilt", we have got archaeological evidence to show that Nālandā was destroyed more than once.²

But though the prophecy can be proved to have been made afterwards, *i.e.*, after the place became famous as an educational centre, and after it was destroyed, we believe that the prediction was made at the time of the very first inception of the University.

The reasons are obvious : First, the prophecy is more appropriately applicable to the whole history of the institution rather than to the various parts; second, (this is, in a sense, contained in the first) the University gained its international reputation only after its rejuvenation at the hands of Bālāditya, alias,

(1) There is no direct evidence to show that Mihirakula razed to the ground the Nālandā buildings. But from the fact that no less than 9 levels of occupation are discovered (*See A. S. I. A. R.* 1923-24, p.70) coupled with the fact that Mihirakula had passed through Magadha, while pursuing Narasimhagupta and carried ravage and destruction throughout the land leads us to think that the buildings were destroyed for the first time by Mihirakula., also *see* Heras, *J. B. O. R. S.*, XIV, pp. 8-9 and *J. B. E. R. A. S.*, II, N. S., pp. 215-216.

(2) *See* footnote (1) above.

Narasimhagupta. Scholars went to Tibet and China during the Panditship of Dharmapāla and many students flocked to Nālandā from these places in this period.¹ And the fame of Nālandā also reached the ears of foreign potentates, who sent emissaries to Nālandā inviting its pandits to their countries and built colleges at Nālandā for the students.² Third, according to the soothsayer, the '*saṅghārāma*' was to flourish for a thousand years. And nobody would be so foolish as to prophesy like that in the face of previous ruin and destruction of the place. Fourth, if we do not take the soothsayer very seriously as regards the age of the University then he was not much wrong; for the institution did flourish for about 800 to 900 years, from 425 A.D. to 1205 A.D. if not for a full period of 1000 years.

As regards the spilling of blood, etc., the massacre and the ravages of the Moslems must have been much greater than that caused by Mihirakula and his band. Because the institution never raised its head up after the onslaught of the Moslems, while it did flourish again and perhaps with greater radiance and prosperity after the destruction at the hands of the Hun King.

Consideration of the genuineness of the prophecy took us, perhaps, out of the track. Let us revert to the point, namely *the factors that contributed to the RISE OF THE UNIVERSITY*.

A *saṅghārāma*, then, was the starting point of the University. The history of the University from this period onwards,—the history of its buildings—of its maintenance, etc., we have subsumed under the title the "Royal Patrons of Nālandā". Because thus only we can describe the part played by the rulers of different dynasties the Guptas, the Vardhanas, the Maukhāris, the Pālas and the Senas, in the development, maintenance and the preservation of the University.

Amongst the patrons that we know of, those mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang draw our attention first. From an earlier re-

(1) *See supra.*

(2) *See supra.*

ference we know that Śakrāditya was the first founder of a *saṅghārāma* at Nālandā.

Hiuen Tsiang, thus, continues his account of the construction of the University. "His son (Śakrāditya's) Buddhagupta-rājā, who succeeded him, continued to labour at the excellent undertaking of his father. To the South of this he built another *saṅghārāma*.

"Tatliāgata-gupta-rājā vigorously practised the former rules of his ancestors, and he built East from this another *saṅghārāma*.

"Bālāditya succeeded to the empire. On the North-east side he built a *saṅghārāma*."

But in addition to this, Bālāditya had built a great *vihāra*, about 300 feet in height. "With respect to its magnificence, its dimensions, and the statue of Buddha placed in it", says Hiuen Tsiang, "it resembles the great *Vihāra* built under the Bodhi tree".¹

And a striking confirmation of Hiuen Tsiang's statement is found in the recently discovered inscription.² In this inscription we are told that Bālāditya "erected as if with a view to see the Kailasa mountain surpassed, a great and extraordinary temple (*prāsāda*) of the illustrious son of Śuddhodana here at Nālandā".

Hiuen Tsiang further says, "This king's son, called Vajra, came to the throne in succession, and was possessed of a heart firm in the faith. He again built on the West side of the convent a *saṅghārāma*. After this a king of Central India built to the North of this a great *saṅghārāma*. Moreover, he built round these edifices a high wall with one gate. A long succession of kings continued the work of building, using all the skill of the sculptor, till the whole is truly marvellous to behold."³ So ends the account of Hiuen Tsiang of the actual building of the University.

(1) Hiuen Tsiang o.c., II, p. 170.

(2) Nālandā Stone Inscription of the Reign of Yaśovarmma deva, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, January, 1929, p. 27.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, pp. 168-70.

I-Tsing's account of the place, though not so exhaustive as that of Hiuen Tsiang, fully corroborates his predecessor's. With regard to the first royal founder of Nālandā buildings, I-Tsing says, "The temple (Nālārdā) was built by an old king, Śri Śakrāditya, for a Bhikṣu of North India called Rāja Bhāja."¹ Continuing he says, "After beginning it, he was much obstructed by other people, but his descendants finished it and made it by far the most magnificent establishment in Jambudvipa. This building is four square, like a city. There are four large gateways of three storeys each. Each storey is some ten feet in height. The whole is covered on with tiles."²

Thus, according to both the Chinese travellers, Śakrāditya was the first king who built a monastery at Nālandā. Moreover, they both tell us that Śakrāditya met with an opposition from the people after beginning the construction of the building. But that it was the descendants of Śakrāditya who made the institution a renowned centre of learning.

Who were these kings mentioned by the Chinese traveller, whether they were Buddhists or Hindus, to what period of Indian history they belonged, whether to the line of the Imperial Guptas or to a branch of that line (for Guptas they were as the endings Guptas of their names signify), are the next questions that are to be considered before we speak of other patrons of Nālandā.

Two scholars have attempted to identify these kings and tried to give them a local habitation and a name. According to Kimura³ we can recognise two Gupta Kings at first sight from the list presented by Hiuen Tsiang, namely, Buddha gupta and Bālāditya. Secondly, he says that Buddhagupta was the successor of Skandagupta, who reigned about 484 A.D. Śakrāditya, therefore, reigned about 450 A.D.; and as

(1) I-Tsing, *Nan-hae-k'i-kwei-niu-fā-ch'uen*, referred to by Beal, *J.R.A.S.*, XIII (N.S.), p. 571.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) The Shifting of the Centre of Buddhism in India, *Journal of The Department of Letters*, I, pp. 36-38.

Skandagupta ruled, as it has been established, from 455 to 480 A.D., "Śakrāditya consequently becomes identical with Skandagupta." Thirdly, on the strength of Vincent Smith's authority, he says that "Buddhagupta was the king of Nālandā and belonged to another branch of the main Guptas."

Incomplete as this identification is, it also appears to be incorrect. In the first place we can identify all the kings, excluding the King of Central India, for the present, as Gupta Kings and not only two. For if Buddhagupta was a Gupta, his father Śakrāditya must also be a Gupta. As to Tathāgata-gupta, does not his name too sound like the name of a Gupta King? Then his son and successor must also be a Gupta.

All the kings therefore mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang are Guptas, whether they belonged to the line of the Imperial Guptas or not we shall know if we can show that Śakrāditya or any of his successors was an Imperial Gupta. For, according to Hiuen Tsiang, all the kings formed one unbroken line of kings. According to Heras,¹ therefore, the identification of Kimura would fall through for the following reasons:

(1) Śakrāditya seems to be Kumāragupta I because (a) Skandagupta was the son and successor of Kumāragupta I,² just as Buddhagupta was the son of Śakrāditya. (b) Another reason that has been very rightly suggested by Heras is that Hiuen Tsiang does not seem to give the original names of the Gupta Kings, but their titles or some titles taken in the later period. And thus he argues that as Kumāragupta I's coins bear witness of his having used the title of Mahendrāditya,³ and that as Mahendra is the same as Śakra, Kumāragupta I is the same as Śakrāditya.

From the above discussion it is evident that Kumāragupta I, an Imperial Gupta, was the founder of the University of

(1) *J.B.O.R.S.*, XIV, pp. 1-7.

(2) Bhitari Inscription of Skandagupta, Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 55, ll. 5 and 6.

(3) Allan, *Gupta Coins*, p. 41. See also footnote (2) below p. 48.

Nālandā, and not Skandagupta as Kimura tries to make out.¹ While fixing the date of the University we shall come to the same conclusion from other reasons.²

As regards Buddhagupta, we know that he was the son and successor of Śakrāditya, alias, Kumāragupta³ while epigraphical evidence⁴ tells us that Skandagupta was the son and successor of Kumāragupta I. It naturally follows, therefore, that Buddhagupta was the same as Skandagupta. Vincent Smith even admits that he seems to belong to the Imperial Guptas.⁵ There are no proofs to show that Buddhagupta belonged to the branch line of the Guptas; secondly, that he is not the same as Skandagupta; thirdly, Vincent Smith nowhere says, as Kimura alleges, that Buddhagupta was the king of Nālandā (only). He, in fact, was the sovereign ruler of Magadha and Nālandā, naturally, came under his sway.

Since the names Buddhagupta and Tathāgatagupta connote connexion with Buddhism, it is up to us to prove that these kings looked favourably at Buddhism.

About Skandagupta we know nothing. But we can say that a son,—and that again in ancient India (if it were in modern times we may expect otherwise)—would not go against the religious inclinations of his father. Consequently even if Skandagupta was not a devout Buddhist, he did not lose anything if he acted according to the wish of Nālandā authorities and order another *saṅghārāma* to be built by the side of his father's.

(1) Kimura, o.c., p. 38.

(2) Very recently a gold coin of Kumāragupta Mahendra I was found immediately above the earliest concrete payment in the verandah in the north-east corner of Monastery No. 4 Nālandā. See A.S.I.A.R., 1928-29, p. 145. It may have been dropped there. So before commenting upon it we should await more finds of coins and inscriptions.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 168.

(4) Bhitari Inscription, o.c., p. 55.

(5) Vincent Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 332.

Such an act proceeding from sheer charity if not from faith in Buddhism would do credit to him and much more to his father. For evidently the institution founded by his father was showing signs of prosperity. And who would not like the father's institution thus prospering, thus fulfilling the cherished desire of his father ! Even a hundred *śrāddhas* would not gain him so much.

Coming to Puragupta, we find ourselves treading on surer grounds. His coins bear the words *Sri Vikramāḥ*,¹ and this must refer to King Vikramāditya, who was the patron of Buddhism and sent his crown prince to study under Vasubandhu.² Precisely for this reason, it appears, that Hiuen Tsiang calls him *Tathāgatagupta-rāja*.

From other evidence also, we can show that Puragupta was the same as Tathāgatagupta. Bālāditya, otherwise known as Narasimhagupta, was the son of Puragupta and succeeded him to the empire in 467 A. D.³ This exactly corresponds with what we learn from Hiuen Tsiang and his biographer that Bālāditya was the son and successor of Tathāgatagupta.⁴

King Vajra spoken of by Hiuen Tsiang has been identified with King Vikramāditya II who was the son and successor of Narasimhagupta according to the Bhitari seal of Kumāragupta II.⁵

The only king who remains to be identified is the King of Central India who built a great *sāṅghārāma*, and an encircling wall with one gate.

(1) Allan, o. c., p. 1. c.

(2) Takakusu, *Paramartha's Life of Vasubandhu*, J.R.A.S., 1905, p. 44.

(3) Vincent Smith, o.c., p. 329.

(4) *Records*, II, p. 168; *Life*, p. 111. Raychaudhuri, (*Political History of Ancient India*, p. 297), however, thinks that Bālāditya of Hiuen Tsiang and Narasimhagupta Bālāditya, the son and successor of Puragupta, were not identical persons.

(5) *Ind. Ant.*, XIX, p. 225.

King Harṣavardhana of Kanauj appears to be the King of Central India. Hiuen Tsiang twice refers to him in connexion with the University.¹ That Harṣa had openly declared himself in favour of Buddhism is clear from Hiuen Tsiang's account.² It is no wonder, therefore, that a king like Harṣa should build a *saṅghārāma* for the propagation of Buddhism.³ Moreover, Harṣa was the only King of Central India who on account of his supremacy could stretch his hand of charity towards a distant place as Nālandā. No other king, of lesser position than Harṣa, dare do it. The occasion when Harṣa built the *saṅghārāma* etc. must have been, as suggested by Heras,⁴ after he defeated Śaśāṅka, the greatest oppressor of Buddhism after Mihirakula. The reason why Hiuen Tsiang calls Harṣa 'the King of Central India' and not by his real name is possibly this: the Chinese traveller, though he mentions Harṣa first and then Nālandā (as given by Beal in his translation), had in fact visited first Nālandā and then Kanauj. This is clear from the order which Harṣa sent to Kumārarājā, King of Kāmarupa which ran as follows: "I desire you to come at once to the assembly with the strange Śramaṇa, you are entertaining at the Nālandā convent."⁵ From this it follows that Hiuen Tsiang had never seen Harṣa before and that he went to Nālandā first and then to Kanauj. Hiuen Tsiang's ignorance, therefore, about Harṣa's name is quite explicable. He must have been given to understand on his inquiring about the *saṅghārāmas* that one in question was built by a king of Central India; or it may be that Harṣa was better known by the title King of Central India, a title of greater importance than the mere name Harṣa.

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., I, p. 216.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 218.

(3) But perhaps the strongest reason for the supposition is that Harṣa had, in fact, built a *vihāra* of brass at Nālandā. (Hwui Li, o. c., p. 159.) And therefore it is not unlikely that he had also built a *saṅghārāma* at Nālandā.

(4) *J.B.O.R.S.*, XIV, p. 15.

(5) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., I, p. 216.

The kings, then, who participated in making the University buildings "marvellous to behold" when Hiuen Tsiang visited the place were real figures of history, and it will be clear from the under-mentioned parallel columns.

Śakrāditya—Kumāragupta I (415 A. D. to 455 A. D.).

Buddhaguptarājā—Skandagupta (455 A. D.).

Tathāgatagupta—Puragupta. (467 A. D.?).

Bālādityarājā—Bālāditya—Narasimhagupta (470 A.D.).

Vajra—Kumāragupta II (473 A.D.)¹.

King of Central India—Harṣa of Kanauj.

The contribution of each of these kings in the construction and development of the University we have noted by a reference to Hiuen Tsiang. Now, before we go to describe any other part played by these kings in relation to the University's diverse activities, we should settle the date of the royal-rise of Nālandā, a question though coming earlier than the identification of various kings, was passed over for some reasons to be mentioned hereafter.

Though the Chinese traveller gives the name of the king, viz., Śakrāditya, who founded the University, he does not tell us when exactly or even approximately it was founded. Since, we have been able to identify Śakrāditya with Kumāragupta I, we can settle the date of the foundation of the University, if we can fix the date when Kumāragupta I came to the throne and the period of his regime.

The earliest date of Kumāragupta I, that we know of, is A.D. 415-16, gleaned from the *Bilsad Stone Pillar Inscription*.² It appears that the king was a Śaivaite when he ascended the throne as the inscription just referred to speaks of the Śaiva form of worship. While another inscription, *Mankuwar Stone Inscription*, is Buddhist³ and the date recorded therein, probably the latest known of Kumāragupta I, is 448-49. A. D.

(1) Vincent Smith, *E.H.I.*, p. 346.

(2) Fleet, o.c., p. 43.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 206.

Naturally, therefore, the king's religious views underwent a change between these years, viz., 415-449. And it appears that the king to show that he was a devout Buddhist built *saṅghārāma* at Nālandā for the propagation of Buddhist learning. But this step he is not likely to take at the end of his reign in about 450 A.D., but earlier. Now if the conversion came earlier, say in about 420, then we can expect such a gesture on the part of Kumāragupta within five or ten years of his conversion, that is to say, in 425 A.D.¹ Hence the year 425 A.D. is the most approximate date of the royal establishment of the University.

The same date can be arrived at also if instead of starting with Kumāragupta, the founder of the University, we just begin in a reverse order, to wit, from Bālāditya Narasimhagupta, the restorer of the University. For it was he who defeated the Huns under Mihirakula and regained the lost prestige of the Guptas. He came to the throne in or about A.D. 500. And now if we accept Sammaddar's or Heras' view and allot, as they do, 25 years as an average to the reign of Puragupta and Skandagupta, then we reach 450 A.D., a date we learn from another source², when he was already the ruler of Magadha. And once again assuming that he built the University not in the closing years of his regime, but say between 420 and 448 A.D., we, once more, come to the conclusion already suggested by us, viz., that the University was probably founded in or about 425 A.D.

The assumption that the University could not have been built earlier than the year, 415 or 416 A.D., rests only on this: that we know of no date of Kumāragupta, the founder, earlier than 415-16 A.D., and his leanings towards Buddhism as early as that date. So if some earlier date can be gathered from epigraphic or numismatic evidence, as also his religious views, there need not be any objection to shift the date of the estab-

(1) Though this does not conclusively indicate a change of faith on the part of the king, still it does indicate a catholicity of outlook on religious matters.

(2) Allan, o.c., p. 41.

blishment of the University. For the mere fact that Fa-hien, perhaps the earliest Chinese traveller, did not speak gloriously of the place should not deter us from assuming, if it can be assumed on other grounds, that the University was founded, earlier, say in 400 A.D. Because we have already remarked, elsewhere, that Fa-hien might not have visited it at all, or if he did, by nature he preferred to be brief in his description of the places he visited, unless the place was so unusually attractive and great that it compelled a little elaborate description from him, and even in such cases his account of these places is meagre when compared with his successor's, namely, Hiuen Tsiang's.

It must be evident to the reader that an effort has been made to fix the date only of the *saṅghārāma* (as Hiuen Tsiang calls it) built by Śakrāditya, *i.e.*, Kumāragupta I. The reason for this is obvious. Nālandā as a University came into existence only in the reign of the early Guptas; that is to say Kumāragupta and others. It is not till this period that anything like a stream of scholastic pilgrimage begins to flow towards Nālandā, when it was recognised as an educational centre. Before this, Nālandā might have been and very likely it was, in the times of Nāgārjuna in the second century A.D. and even in still remoter times—in the days of Buddha, a great religious as well as an educational centre. But as our knowledge of this period is scanty and that too not based on purely historical material we have sketched the history of Nālandā from the times of Kumāragupta I.

Let us now resume the history of Nālandā and its ROYAL PATRONS.

Harṣa, as we know, built a great *saṅghārāma* at Nālandā.¹ But, besides this, he constructed a *vihāra* with brass plates² and a high wall round all the buildings.³ However, this was not all. He helped and encouraged the University in other

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 159.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170.

ways too. There were numerous students and professors who were to be maintained by the institution. And Harṣa, over and above the provision he must have made for the food and raiment for these, took upon himself the feeding of some forty priests every day as a special charge in order to show his gratitude, as the Chinese visitor says,¹ to the founder.

Still another way, in which the University received help from Harṣa was that he, wherever he went and whatever his other religious professions might be, championed and upheld the religious and philosophical doctrines preached by Nālandā. Thus, for instance, while touring through Orissa he came across some learned Hinayānists. They ridiculed him for having built a *vihāra* at Nālandā which, they said, believed in "sky flower" doctrine (*Śūnyavāda?*). But Harṣa asserted the superiority of this doctrine over that of the Hinayānists, and to prove it he sent a messenger to Nālandā with a note on Śilabhadra. Therein he said, "Your servant, whilst progressing through Orissa, met some priests of the Little Vehicle who, hampered by contracted views adhere to a *sāstra* which abuses the principles of the Great Vehicle. They speak of the followers of that system as men of a different religion, and they wish to hold a controversy with you on this point. Now I know that in your convent there are eminent priests and exceedingly gifted, of different schools of learning, who will undoubtedly be able to overthrow them—so now, in answer to their challenge, I beg you to send four men of eminent ability, well acquainted with one and the other school, and also with esoteric and exoteric doctrine, to the country of Orissa."²

The passage, besides showing the high esteem and regard for Nālandā and its pandits, brings forth in no unmistakable terms the efforts he made to spread the Nālandā culture.

Hiuen Tsiang's account of the story of the construction of the University does not stop with Harṣa. For, he says, "A

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 160.

long succession of kings continued the work of building....”¹ What exactly Hiuen Tsiang means by these words is, indeed, very difficult to make out. The difficulty lies in this: we have identified “the King of Central India” with Harṣa; and Harṣa and Hiuen Tsiang were contemporaries. Consequently the words, “a long succession of kings,” could not verily refer to the kings after Harṣa. Evidently, therefore, they must be some kings who flourished after Bālāditya and before Harṣa. But this interpretation is not warranted by the sequence in which the account is narrated.

However, interpreting as Heras does,² that is, by supposing that the latter sentence must precede the words, “a long succession of kings,” these words might refer to the later Guptas and others who flourished before Harṣa.³

Next to Guptas and Vardhanas, royalties who seem to have shown a friendly interest in Nālandā seem to be Varmans, some of whom were Maukhāris and very probably ruled at Kanauj.

Now Hiuen Tsiang⁴ speaks of one Pūrṇavarma who presented to Nālandā “a figure of Buddha standing upright and made of copper, 80 feet in height,” and to cover which he constructed a pavilion of six stages. This Pūrṇavarma, as Heras⁵ thinks, was the last of the Maukhāris.

Besides these references to Varmans, some seals and an inscription have been discovered which contain references to Varmans. One of the seals speaks of Sureśvaravarman and his geneology⁶. But the scanty data furnished by the seals is a

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170.

(2) J.B.O.R.S., XIV, p. 12 n. 1.

(3) *Ibid.* But it seems that Hiuen Tsiang does not refer to other kings but only sums up the work of construction of the earlier kings from Kumāragupta I to Harṣa. This interpretation would be at once apparent if we add ‘thus’ and read, “(Thus) a long succession of kings continued the work of building.. till the whole is truly marvellous to behold.”

(4) o.c., II, p. 174.

(5) o.c., p. 18.

(6) This is based on a paper “*The Seals of Nālandā*” read by Dr.

little improved by a recent discovery of an inscription at Nālandā.¹ Herein, we are told that Mālāda, a minister of King Yaśovarmmadeva made various kinds of offerings to the Nālandā monks, paid for their daily food and donated money equal to the price of the whole Nālandā institution.²

Mālāda was a son of Tikina, guardian of the Northern routes. The peculiarity of the names Mālāda and Tikina which seem un-Sanskritic and the reference to the Northern routes, have led scholars to identify him as a Tukharian.³

The interest and patronage which must have been received from the overlord of Mālāda, Yaśovarmmadeva, can be better imagined than described in absence of specific evidence. Yaśovarmman must have in all probability built a *saṅghārāma* or a *vihāra* at Nālandā.

Now who was this Yaśovarmman and when and where did he rule is not given by the inscription. Hirananda Sastri's view that he was an overlord of the King Bālāditya, Narasimha-gupta and is no other than the King Yaśodharma of Mandasor inscription does not seem to be warranted from the arguments adduced by him. These, rather, if they prove anything at all, as has been shown⁴, point to the King Yaśovarmmadeva, who had a capital at Kanauj and flourished in or about 728-745. A.D.⁵

Hira Nand Shastri at the First Historical Congress, Bombay. The seals he speaks of are perhaps the same referred to by *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1917-18, p. 44-45.

(1) *Nālandā Stone Inscription of the Reign of Yasovarmmadeva*, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, January, 1929, p. 37.

(2) This is the interpretation we put on the following English version of the original: "He (Mālāda), purchased (everything of) his own here (at Nālandā) from the revered Saṅgha and gave back according to rites barring the monks robes." *See Ibid.*, verse 10, p. 46.

(3) See Hirananda Sastri, o.c., p. 41 and Bhattacharji, *Modern Review*, September, 1931, p. 307.

(4) Bhattacharji, o.c., pp. 306-307; also Majumdar, *I. H. Q.*, September, 1931, p. 664.

(5) *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 775-777.

This inscription fills up the gap which would otherwise have been felt in the account of kings connected with Nālandā. For after Harṣa no royal personage is, at present, known to have extended his hand of generosity to the University until we meet the Pālas in or about the year A.D. 750. Yaśovarmma-deva-inscription is proved to belong to the king of the same name who reigned from 734-748 A.D.

The history of the ROYAL PATRONS OF NALANDA, thus, though appeared to be suddenly breaking off after Harṣa is now proved to be a continuous one, barring a period of about 100 years—from 648-734 A.D.

The middle of the eighth century brings us to the Pālas, who had just then emerged from the political chaos in Bengal as her elected rulers. Gopāla, the first king, on account of the turbulent times in which he came to acquire the Pāla throne could have hardly done anything for Nālandā.

His son Dharmapāladeva must have patronised the University in some manner or another. This conjecture is supported by a recent discovery of a copperplate at Nālandā.¹ But it is so hopelessly defaced that beyond the legend *Dharmapāladevah* which is inscribed on a seal soldered at the top and engraved in one line below the *Dharmacakra* and the fact that it was issued from a royal camp nothing can be made out.

It was only in the times of Dēvapāla, however, that the University once more found a king of the type of Harṣa, who seems to have completely identified himself with the cause for which the University stood. This is evident from the find of a number of metallic figures, male as well as female, all of which contain a reference to King Dēvapāla². But of greater consequence than these figures are the two inscriptions which bear testimony to the above remarks in no unmistakable terms.

(1) See *A.S.I.A.R.*, 1926-27, pp. 138-39.

(2) Of such figures, two, one of Hāritī and another of Balarāma are very interesting and instructive. See *Ibid.*, 1924-25, and 1926-1927, p. 132 respectively.

The two inscriptions mentioned are: “*The Nālandā Copperplate of Dēvapāladēvu*”¹ and the other “*Ghosrawa Buddhist Inscription*.”² The first one tells us that the King Bālaputradeva of Suvarṇadvīpa “was attracted by the manifold excellences of Nālandā and through devotion to the son of Śuddodana (the Buddha)...built here (at Nālandā) a monastery, which was the abode of the assembly of monks of various good qualities and was white with the series of stuccoed and lofty dwellings;”³ and that he had requested King Devapāladēva through an ambassador of his, Balavarmman, to grant five villages, Nandivanāka, Maṇivāṭaka, Naṭikā, Hasti and Pālāmaka towards the income for the blessed Lord Buddha, the abode of all the virtues like *Prajñāpāramitā*, for the offerings, oblations, shelter, garments, etc., of the assembly of the venerable bhikkhus...and for the upkeep and repair of the monastery when damaged.⁴

The importance of this inscription can never be over-estimated. Not only Nālandā had acquired the patronage of a Pāla King of Bengal, Dēvapāladēva, but had secured even the patronage of a king from far off Suvarṇadvīpa and Yavadvīpa, the modern islands of Sumatra and Java. And this patronage was of no mean degree, consisted as it did of a monastery, and grant of five villages for its maintenance and preservation, while it places King Bālaputradeva in the same distinguished category of Kings, Kumāragupta I, Narasimhagupta and Harṣa who contributed to the rise and development of Nālandā and gave it a unique position among the centres of learning.

If this much can be said to the credit of a foreign king in relation to Nālandā, much more could be said of a king who was the actual witness to the splendour and glory of an institu-

(1) *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, pp. 310-327.

(2) *Ind. Ant.*, XVII, pp. 307-12.

(3) *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, verse 32, p. 327.

(4) *Ibid.*, ll. 33-37 and 37-42, p. 325. The monastery of Bālaputradeva, the foundation of which is recorded in the inscription of Dēvapāla, is not merely a name, its remains form one of the levels of Monastery No. 1 at Nālandā. See Kuraishi, *Guide to Nālandā*, p. 4.

tion, which drew from a foreign king a munificent gift, in spite of the fact, that we have, as yet, not discovered any evidence of Dēvapāla having built a monastery at Nālandā.

Nevertheless, evidence of a patronage of another character is supplied by the second inscription, the *Ghosrawa Inscription*. From it we learn¹ that Dēvapāladēva received and patronised a very learned Brāhmaṇi, named Vīradēva, who had come to Nālandā after visiting many centres of learning such as Kaniṣka *vihāra* and Yaśovarmmapura. While this very Vīradēva, we are further told,² was afterwards elected the head of the *saṅgha* by the assembly of monks. It is probable that King Dēvapāla might be connected with the administration of the University, which besides the profound learning of Vīradēva must be the cause of his being elected as the head of the *saṅgha*.

After Dēvapāla the chain again seems to break, for we have no records of Pāla Kings after Dēvapāla till we come to Gopāla II. It is only when we come to Gopāla II that the name of Nālandā is once again mentioned in relation to a Pāla King. This relation is referred to on the foot of an image of a goddess Vāgiśvarī thus: The image of the goddess Vāgiśvarī, at Nālandā, was covered with a gold-leaf by some unnamed person in the first year of Gopāladēva.³ This Gopāladēva is identified with Gopāla II by Banerji.⁴ As his regime over Magadha was very short we cannot say if he could encourage the University save with some donations.

With the reconquest of Magadha by Mahīpāla I, Nālandā once more found a royal patron of the type of Gopāla II. Even so late as the 10th century A.D. copying of *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* was considered a very pious and meritorious act. One Kalyāṇamitra Cintāmani, a resident of Nālandā, prepared such a copy and to show respect for the king who

(1) *Ind. Ant.*, XVII, Line 10, p. 311.

(2) *Ibid.*, Line., 11.

(3) *J.A.S.B.*, N.S., IV, p. 105.

(4) *The Pālas of Bengal*, p. 65.

held the destinies of Nālandā, concluded it, by saying that *Prajñāpāramitā* was copied out by him in the sixth year of the reign of Mahīpāla, the son of Vigrahapāla.¹

Incidentally, therefore, we can say that Vigrahapāla also, if he was in power, must have done something for an institution that was reared up and maintained by his forefathers. In or about the eighth or ninth year of Mahīpāla's reign, the great temple (perhaps of Bālāditya) was burnt down. And though Mahīpāla himself did not actually repair and restore it, we are told that in the 11th year of his reign, the temple was rebuilt by a person named Bālāditya, a *jyāriśa* of Tiladhaka (modern Telara) who had immigrated from Kauśambi.²

The next reference to a Pāla King and Nālandā as well, is to be found in another of such manuscripts. Here we are told that *Aṣṭāśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* was copied out by one Grahaṇakuṇḍa in the fourth regnal year of Rāmapāla.³ The times, however, which Rāmapāla had to face, periods of alternate success and defeat, could have hardly enabled him to turn his attention towards Nālandā.

Govindapāladēva was perhaps the last Pālā King, who patronised Nālandā. For, after his death in or about 1197 A.D. both, the various dynasties of kings—the Cauhan, Gaharwar, Pālā and Sena, who were long since contending over the spoils of Magadha, were exterminated by the violent storm of Moslem invasion,—and Nālandā, too, met a similar fate.

Now, according to a manuscript⁴, *Aṣṭāśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* was copied in the 4th year of the reign of Govindapāladēva. This Govindapāladēva, thinks Banerji,⁵ was very likely a Pālā King, though it cannot be said for certain

(1) Bendall, *Cat. of Buddhist Sans. MSS. in the Univ. Liby., Cambridge*, p. 101.

(2) *J.A.S.B.*, IV, p. 106, No. IV, pl. VI.

(3) See *Cat. of Sans. MSS. in the Bodlian Liby., Cambridge*, II, p. 250.

(4) *J.R.A.S.*, N.S. VIII (1876), p. 3; as well as (*Bib. Ind. Cal.* 1888).

(5) o.c., p. 108.

if he descended from the Imperial Pālā dynasty or not.¹ He ruled over Magadha from A.D. 1161 to 1197.²

Thus ends the history of Nālandā and the kings who patronised it in various ways. Not only the Pālās, who ruled over Magadha for some four centuries, contributed their mite according to the vicissitudes of time in which they flourished, to the maintenance and preservation of art and culture as embodied in Nālandā but others also the Gurjara-Pratihāras and others who now and then invaded Magadha, contributed their mite or shall we say, forced the University to acknowledge their suzerainty and even record it. One of the votive *stupas*³, unearthed at Nālandā, contains a reference to Māhindrapāladēva. And he is now definitely identified⁴ with not one of the Pālā Kings as Kielhorn,⁵ Smith⁶ and M. M. H. P. Shastri⁷ once thought, but as a Gurjara-Pratihāra who had annexed Magadha in or about the 10th century A.D.

Apart from the Pālās and Gurjara-Pratihāras, it will be not too much to assume that even the Senas, under whose sway had come the Eastern, Western, and Northern Bengal and the Eastern part of Maghadha, might have stretched their hand of charity to the University of Bengal.

It is hoped, however, that further excavations at Nālandā and other neighbouring places in Maghada will bring to light more epigraphical and numismatic evidence which will enable us to give a continued, unbroken history of Nālandā and its patrons.⁸

(1) o.c., p. 108.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 108 & 112.

(3) *See A.S.I.A.R.*, 1924-25, p. 86.

(4) Banerji, o.c., p. 66.

(5) *Ep. Ind.*, VIII. App. p. 118, Note 2.

(6) *Ind. Ant.*, XXXVIII, p. 246.

(7) *Mem. A.S.B.*, III, p. 16.

(8) Hirananda Sastri says that he has discovered at Nālandā some seals of the Gupta Kings Narasimhagupta, his son Kumāragupta, Budhagupta and Vainyagupta. Probably they will throw some light on the relation of these kings with Nālandā. *See Ep. Ind.*, XXI, April, 1931, p. 77. Even so late as the 12th century A.D., according to an inscription

After having, thus, discussed the contribution of various kings towards the building of the Nālandā University, we may just note what the actual arrangement of the buildings was and how they looked.

From the account of Hiuen Tsiang it appears that there were at least six colleges at Nālandā. For each king, beginning with Kumāragupta I down to Harṣa, built a *vihāra* or *saṅghārāma* at Nālandā. And if we include the *vihāra* built by Bālaputradeva, King of Suvarṇadvīpa, then there would be no less than seven *vihāras*. As a matter of fact, when I-Tsing visited Nālandā, at least a century before Bālaputra thought of building a *vihāra* at Nālandā, there were already in existence eight colleges¹ (halls, as I-Tsing calls them), having as many as 300 rooms.²

These *saṅghārāmas* were built in a row (or in parallel rows as would appear from the excavations). And there is no doubt that many of these *saṅghārāmas* or *vihāras* were three to four storeys high, for their lofty height and grandeur are repeatedly mentioned in all the inscriptions, as well as by Hiuen Tsiang and his biographer.³ As one inscription very beautifully says, “She (Nālandā) had a row of *vihāras*, the line of whose tops touched the sky...Nālandā (was full of the) heaps of the rays of the *chaityas* shining and bright like white clouds.....

recently found at Nālandā, a Buddhist ascetic Vipulaśrimitra erected a monastery ‘an ornament of the world’. Chatterji, who has edited the epigraph, thinks that the monastery built by the ascetic was identical with Monastery No. VII in whose debris the inscription was discovered. See *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, July, 1931, p. 97.

(1) From the account of Hiuen Tsiang’s biographer it seems that there were already eight colleges even when Hiuen Tsiang visited Nālandā. He says, “One gate opens into the great college from which are separated eight other halls, standing in the middle.” Hwui Li, o.c., p. 111.

(2) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 105. The number of rooms given by I-Tsing seems to be pretty accurate. For, from the buildings that have been excavated at Nālandā it appears that there were at least 30 to 40 rooms in each monastery.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, pp. 170 and 173-174. Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 111-112.

“Nālandā had temples which were brilliant on account of the network of the rays of the various jewels set in them and was the pleasant abode of the learned and virtuous *saṅgha* and resembled Sumeru, the charming residence of the Vidyādharaś.”¹

According to Tibetan accounts,² moreover, Nālandā had a grand library, called Dharmagañja (Piety Mart). It consisted of three grand buildings called Ratnasāgara, Ratnodadhi and Ratnarañjaka, respectively. In Ratnodadhi, which was nine-storeyed, there were the sacred scripts called *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and Tāntric works such as *Samājaguhyā*³ etc.

We cannot close the account of the buildings of Nālandā in a better manner than by quoting what Hiuen Tsiang (who had stayed at Nālandā) felt and experienced. “The whole establishment (the *vihāras*, *saṅghārāmas*, and the library) is surrounded by a brick wall. One gate opens into the great college, from which are separated eight other halls, standing in the middle (of the *saṅghārāma*).

“The richly adorned towers and the fairy-like turrets, like the pointed hill-tops, are congregated together. The observatories seem to be lost in the vapour (of the morning) and the upper rooms tower above the sky.

“From the windows one may see how the winds and the clouds (produce new forms), and above the soaring eaves the conjunctions of the sun and moon (may be observed).

“All the outside courts, in which are the priests’ chambers are of four stages. The stages have dragon projections and—

(1) *Nālandā Stone Inscription of the Reign of Yasovarmmadeva*, Ep. Ind., XX, p. 45.

(2) *Vide Pag-samjon-zang*, edited in the original Tibetan by Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Das, C.I.E., at Calcutta, p. 92. *Vidyabhusana*, H.I.L., p. 516.

(3) This is, I think, the same as *Guhya-samāja-Tantra* published in G.O.S., No. LXIII.

coloured eaves, the pearl-red pillars carved and ornamented¹, the richly adorned balustrades, and the roofs covered with tiles that reflect the light in a thousand shades. These things add beauty to the place.”²

Nālandā, in short, with its “scholars well known for their (knowledge of the) sacred texts and art,” and with its “learned and virtuous *saṅgha*”, and its brilliant and magnificent *chaityas*, and *vihāras*, was, as an inscription says, “a city which mocked as it were at all the cities of the kings.”

(1) Cf. this description with the one of the inscription just quoted, “....temples, brilliant on account of the network of the rays of the various jewels set in them.”

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 111-112.

CHAPTER IV STUDIES OF NĀLANDĀ

IN the preceding Chapters we reviewed the conditions under which Nālandā had sprung up, and the curricula that were prevalent before its rise. In this Chapter we propose to discuss (i) the curriculum that was actually followed at Nālandā, and (ii) the efforts that the University made to impart knowledge in the various items of that curriculum.

In stating the curriculum that was followed at Nālandā we have to be very cautious, for the reason that we meet with statements which, unless they are properly scrutinized, would seem contradictory. Hiuen Tsiang¹ says, for instance, that one (a student) must have studied deeply both old and new (books) before getting admission (at Nālandā). By "old and new books" Hiuen Tsiang evidently refers to works such as *Vēdas*, *Upaniṣads*, works of different systems—*Sāṃkhya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Nyāya* and all the works of *Mahāyāna* and *Hinayāna* Buddhism. Thus we find that a student was supposed to have knowledge of these subjects before he sought admission at Nālandā.

His biographer,² however, seems to contradict him. He says that students in Nālandā study the Great Vehicle and also (the works belonging to) the eighteen sects, and not only these, but even ordinary works, such as the *Vēdas* and other books, the *Hetuvidyā*, *Śabdavidyā*, the *Cikitsāvidyā*, the works on Magic (*Atharvavēda*), the *Sāṃkhya*; besides these they thoroughly investigate the "miscellaneous" works. That these subjects were taught at Nālandā is beyond doubt, because Hiuen Tsiang himself studied the *Yogaśāstra*, the *Nyāya-Ann-*

(1) o.c., II, p. 171.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 112.

sāra-śāstra, *Hetuvidyā-śāstra*, the *Sabdavidyā* and works on Mahāyāna such as the *Koṣa*, *Vibhāṣā*, etc., at Nālandā from Śilabhadra and others.¹

Now the question naturally arises: How do you explain that a student was supposed to have knowledge of these subjects before he joined the Nālandā University and also that these subjects were taught there?

The only way to solve this problem is to suppose that Nālandā was essentially a teaching University because students were instructed in all the varied branches of learning as we are told by Hwui Li. But those scholars who came from other centres of learning had to undergo a strict test of their knowledge before they could prosecute their studies at Nālandā. These outsiders were eager to pass the examination and obtain the Nālandā degree. This will be clear from a study of Hiuen Tsiang's and I-Tsing's records.

Hiuen Tsiang says, "Learned men from different cities, who desire quickly to acquire a renown in discussion, come here in multitudes to settle their doubts, and the streams (of their wisdom) spread far and wide."²

The method in which the University conducted the examination is very interesting. The examiners, we are told, were no other than the keepers of the gate. They were very learned men, and those who wanted to get admission in the University had to enter into a discussion with these gate-keepers who often-times put to them very hard questions. The chances of their success depended upon their ability to please and satisfy the examiners by hard discussion.³

I-Tsing also fully corroborates what his predecessor had noticed. He writes⁴, "Thus instructed by their teachers and instructing others they (students) pass two or three years, generally in the Nālandā monastery in Central India or in the

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 121.

(2) o.c., II, p. 170.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) o.c., p. 177.

country of Valabhi in Western India. There eminent and accomplished men assemble in crowds, discuss possible and impossible doctrines, and after being assured of their excellence of their opinions by wise men, become far-famed for their wisdom."

Thus the examination consisted of "any process of enquiry", as Rashdall says¹ of the method followed in the European Universities, "into the candidate's fitness as well as direct testing of his scholastic attainments."

The University adopted this method only in the case of persons who, says Hiuen Tsiang, "come from other quarters", or again "students who come as strangers."²

We have thus shown that there were two classes of students studying at Nālandā and hence the seeming contradiction as regards the curriculum followed at Nālandā.

The curriculum of the University was very exhaustive and embraced many of the subjects of the pre-Nālandā period.

Now the students did not take up all the subjects that have been enumerated. But there were some subjects which almost all the students had to study, which in a sense were "compulsory" as we now understand the term.

Being primarily a religious institution, Nālandā had made Theology compulsory for all the students.³ And knowledge of Theology meant a thorough grasp of all the works on Mahāyāna besides acquaintance with all the eighteen schools of Buddhism.⁴ Mahāyāna, by the time the University had sprung up, consisted, on its philosophical or metaphysical side, of at least two schools, viz., *Śūnyavāda* and *Vijñānavāda* or Nihilism and Idealism.

Of these doctrines that came to be propounded and subsumed under the general term Mahāyāna, the one that became

(1) o.c., p. 442.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, pp. 170-171.

(3) Cf. the words of Hwui Li who says, "All study the Great Vehicle," o.c., p. 112.

(4) *Ibid.*, n. 1.

more popular than others at Nālandā was the “Sky-flower” doctrine.¹ This doctrine was fully explained in the *Śuraṅgama Sūtra*. The *Sūtra* was composed at Nālandā and was probably the work of Dharmapāla. There was another *Sūtra* of the same name, but it was totally different from the one in question. For it was translated by Kūmarājīva and recited by Fa-hien at the Vulture Peak near Rājagrīha. This *Sūtra* was brought to China and translated in A.D. 705. The commentary on the *Sūtra* says, “This *Sūtra* was brought from India and belongs to the Murdhābhishikta school.”²

The doctrine is simply this: that all objective phenomena are only like sky-flowers, unreal, and vanishing.³

It is not difficult to identify this doctrine with the general principles of Mahāyāna, for, we are told, that the priests of Orissa all studied the Little Vehicle and did not believe in the Great Vehicle. They said that it was a system of the “Sky-flower” heretics, and was not delivered by Buddha.⁴ Hīnayānists looked upon this doctrine with such a great contempt that they went to the length of even identifying it with that of the Kāpālika sect.⁵ Harṣa in order to defend this doctrine sent for four distinguished pandits of Nālandā, which was then the centre of the “sky-flower” doctrine. The University, in response to the king’s request, sent four eminent pandits: Sāgaramati, Prajñāraśmi, Siṁharaśmi and the Master of the Law (Hiuen Tsiang).

Though the doctrine as such has been proved to belong to Mahāyāna, it is not easy to say to what particular branch of Mahāyāna doctrines it belongs, whether to that of Nāgārjuna which believes in “All Void”, or to that of the Idealists, who believe that only the ideas exist, *i.e.*, nothing exists except in

(1) *See* Hwui Li, o.c., p. 159.

(2) *See* Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 110, n.

(3) *See* Hwui Li, o.c., p. 159, n.

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) *Ibid.*

our idea: that objects have existence only when they are cognised.

The idea of a sky-flower connotes unreality. If by this unreality it is understood that everything is unreal, the doctrine is nothing but nihilism: the one that was propounded by Nāgārjuna. But, if it suggests that all objects are unreal except when they are perceived by our cognitive faculty, then naturally the doctrine can be identified with that of the Idealists, *viz.*, the *Ālaya Vijñāna* of Maitreya and Āsaṅga.

Leaving this doctrine and its interpretation here we shall refer to some of the works composed for the propagation of Mahāyāna by the pandits of the University, and incidentally the interpretation they put on Mahāyāna.

Sthiramati in his *Mahāyānābhidharmasamyukta-saṅgīti-śāstra* thus speaks of Mahāyāna, "In the Mahāyāna, there are four secrets which include all kinds of truths that Buddha has preached." In another place, in the same work, we find him upholding the Mahāyāna which he calls *Bodhisattva-piṭaka* and running down the Hīnayāna (*Śrāvakayāna*). Says he, "The question is: if the *Śrāvaka-piṭaka* and *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*, etc., are equally derived from the Dharmakāya, then, why the people offering *Bodhisattva-piṭaka* with fragrances and wigs, produce great, limitless fortune and why it is otherwise in the case of *Śrāvukayāna*? Answer: because, the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka* is the foundation of the divine favour and is the source of pleasure for all people."¹

This extolment of Mahāyāna, first seen by us in the *Prajñāpāramitā-śāstra* of Nāgārjuna had been carried on by almost all his followers adding perhaps nothing of their own in the development of philosophy. Their main aim appears to be no other than the refutation of the heretic systems, be they Buddhist or Brāhmaṇic. Statements of like nature we find in Dharmapāla's *Vijñaptimātrasisiddhi-śāstra* where he says, "The

(1) See Bundle, Vol. 8, p. 78 b-a, of *Chinese Tripitaka*; Kimura, o.c., pp. 187-188.

5th *Pravartana* stage is low and inferior; that is to say, the stage of two *yāna* (*Śrāvaka* and *Pratyeka Buddha yāna*) is meant only for the self-benefit and for this purpose suffering is deprecated, while search after *Nirvāṇa* and realisation of the truth of *Ātma-śūnyatā* only are advocated.”¹

Śīlabhadra, the successor of Dharmapāla to the Nālandā-throne, we learn from Chinese and Japanese sources,² had made three divisions of the whole Buddhism according to different characters of the doctrine through the three different categories. The three divisions being:

- (i) The doctrine of existence (*Sarvāstivavāda*).
- (ii) The doctrine of *Śūnyatā*.
- (iii) The doctrine of middle-path.

The first doctrine apparently is that of the Hīnayānists, while the last two of the Mahāyānists. Kimura tells us that with the help of these three divisions, Śīlabhadra deprecated the Hīnayāna and extolled the Mahāyāna.³

Śāntideva in his *Śikṣā-Samuccaya*, whose summary we give below, makes out a very strong case for Mahāyāna. He quotes from *Niyatāniyatāvatāramudrā-Sūtra* wherein the Master tells the disciple, “Even so, Mañjuśri, whosoever after producing the thought of enlightenment holdeth not fast, neither studieth the Great Vehicle, but has intercourse with such as follow the Disciple’s Vehicle, and is intimate with them and readeth their doctrine, and maketh his study therein, and proveth it, and informeth him thereof, and reciteth its topics..... teacheth them, he thereby becometh dull of wit, and is torn away and cast back from the Road of the Highest Wisdom. And whatsoever organ of wisdom, eye of wisdom this Bodhisatva may have gained through meditating upon enlightenment, this eye becomes dull and obstructed.”⁴

(1) Wang Bundle, Vol. 10, p. 44-a; Kimura, o.c., p. 188.

(2) Kimura, o.c., p. 189.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) Śāntideva, *Śikṣā-Samuccaya*, Tr. by Bendall and Rouse, Indian Text Series, p. 7.

Apart from these praises of Mahāyāna that we have just referred to, *Śikṣā-Samuccaya* is a very important work. For it is nothing but a collection of all the earlier Mahāyāna *Sūtras*. Thus it, incidentally, gives us a very exhaustive history of the Mahāyāna literature. The collection of *sūtras* also shows Śāntideva as a great scholar. He had not only read all the *sūtras* but mastered them so that he could quote them with ease. The work, as its name suggests, deals with 'Śikṣā', that is to say, morality or discipline. The work, thus, is a collection of moral instructions.

In the opening verse the author says that one should cast off the fear of pain and danger. This will remove egoism, differences like "This is mine, this is his". He preaches the sacredness of life and exhorts us that it should be preserved. Then we are told that enlightenment of heart will follow if one fixes one's mind on one's faith. Speaking on restraint, he says that the Great Way (Mahāyāna) teaches restraint and one must know all its vital points.

In the next verse he advises people to be charitable in everything, in one's person, enjoyments and one's merits. His advice to friends is that good friends should never be left. He exhorts all to study scriptures. To realise inward peace he prescribes that one should avoid fruitless waste, should develop mindfulness and devotion. To win popularity he advises steadfastness and gentle speech which will win over worthy folk.

He is against complete renouncement of worldly necessities. For he says, "To preserve one's body one must use raiment and medicine." But he also strikes a warning, "Indulgence in one's own desires leads to one's downfall," and so he advises the path of the golden mean. Likewise he advises men to perform noble deeds but asks them not to boast of their good deeds.

His advice when everything is accomplished is to repair to a forest-cell. While to achieve merit he asks people to be merciful and practise the "Void". We quote the last verses in extenso :

“With effort first, before all, place,
 Settled resolve and purpose firm.
 Set mercy to thy face,
 And so for thy merit's increase strive.”

The concluding lines are indeed very noble, when he says :

“Perfection lies in self-denial,
 By never leaving watchfulness,
 It comes by understanding full,
 By mindfulness and deepest thought.”

This work of spreading the doctrine of *Vijñānavāda* was next taken up by Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, two eminent pandits of the University in a work called *Tattvasaṅgraha*. But, as we have grouped this aspect of the work of the University under a separate heading, we do not speak of their work here.

After these luminaries ceased to sparkle, there does not appear anybody in the literary firmament who dazzles us with his light, until we come to the eleventh century, when once more we behold a brilliant star who illuminated not only India but like his predecessors, brightened up such distant lands as Ceylon, and Sumatra in the South, and Tibet in the North. This star was the famous Dīpamīkara Śrījñāna, more popularly known as Atīśa. But, as he belonged more to the sister University of Vikramāśilā, we do not review his activities here. And as the times of Atīśa bring us almost to the end of Nālandā's career, we pass on to the consideration of the second important item of the curriculum.

The subject next to Theology and Philosophy which always went together was Logic. Though it was not compulsory, exigencies of those times, when debates and discussions were very frequent, almost made it compulsory for the students.

This science called *Hetuvidyā* in Sanskrit, as we have seen in our review of various curricula before the rise of the University of Nālandā, was still in a formative state. Different schools of thought, Buddhist, Jain, Sāṃkhyā and others, had

their own systems of Logic. And a student learning at Nālandā had to go through all the systems. For he was expected to defend the Buddhist-systems against others, and this he could not do well unless he knew the principles of other systems.

Let us now see what the contribution of Nālandā pandits was to the development of Logic. Hitherto, up to about 400 A.D., Logic was mixed up with Philosophy and Religion. With the advent of Diññāga in the field, Logic came into prominence. Diññāga, as we shall see later on, was one of the greatest pandits of Nālandā.

Among his many works on Logic, the three important ones that have come down to us are (1) *Nyāyadvāra*, (2) *Nyāyapraveśa*, and (3) *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. I-Tsing however ascribes¹ the following eight works to Jina (Diññāga).² These are :—

- (1) *The Śāstra on the meditation on the Three Worlds.*
- (2) *Sarvalakṣaṇadhyāna-śāstra (kārikā).*
- (3) *The Śāstra on the meditation on the object.*
- (4) *The Śāstra on the Gate of the Cause. (Hetudvāra).*
- (5) *The Śāstra on the Gate of the resembling cause.*
- (6) *The Nyāyadvāra-(tarka)-śāstra* (ascribed to Nāgārjuna wrongly).
- (7) *Prajñapti-hetu-saṃgraha (?) Śāstra.*
- (8) *The Śāstra on the grouped inferences.*

His principal contribution seems to be the rejection of उपन्य and निगमन as necessary premises even in a *Parārthānumāna*. We said principal because even though he is credited with the following contributions :—

1. “The proposition, the point of disputation, or the Thesis, is a judgment, not the terms of a judgment.”³

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., pp. 186-187.

(2) Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 211.

(3) Sugiura, *Hindu Logic*, p. 24.

2. Rejection of the five membered syllogism. Maitreya spoke of two kinds of thesis साध्य, आत्मसंबन्ध and परसंबन्ध and Vasubandhu described two kinds of syllogism, one of five parts and the other of two,¹ it was Diñnāga who took the decisive step of rejecting उपनय and निगमन as superfluous even in a *Parārthānumāna*.

3. “The significance of the middle term (called *Hetu*) for inference and hence for the theory of reasoning, is for the first time discussed by Diñnāga and the result of his study is the famous doctrine of the “Three Phases of *Hetu*” त्रैरूप्य or the three essentials of a good *Hetu*, which are enumerated in our text as पक्षधर्मत्वम्, सपक्षेसत्त्वम्, and विपक्षे चासत्त्वम्”²

Lastly “Introduction of a universal proposition to take the place of old analogical examples.”³

Still they have been questioned and shown to be no contributions at all by Dhruva.⁴ His arguments are briefly summarised as under :—

As regards 1. he says that though the doctrine is found in his work *Pramāṇasamuccaya* Ch. II, yet it does not appear for the first time in his logic or is peculiar to him, because this theory, *viz.*, तद्विद्योषणता of the अनुमेय is held by the Brāhmaṇa logicians as well as by Diñnāga and his school.

As to 2. he says, “If the logical theory which does away with उपनय and निगमन from the *Parārthānumāna* be sound—of which I am not altogether sure—the credit for the reform evidently belongs to Diñnāga.”

With reference to 3. he says that the *Trairūpa* theory is in no way his innovation, because it can be gathered from Vātsyāyana’s *Bhāṣya* on N. S. V, 34.

(1) Vidyabhusana, o. c., p. 269.

(2) Sugiura, o. c., p. 35.

(3) Keith, *Indian Logic and Atomism*, p. 87. I do not find this statement in Keith. Words to this effect are found in Sugiura, o. c., p. 35 and Vidyabhusana, o. c., p. 295-296.

(4) A. B. Dhruva, *Nyāyapraveśa*, G.O.S., No. XXXVIII, p. XXIII.

As to Keith's view he not only endorses Dr. Randle's opinion that "so far as I know no evidence has yet been produced to show that the doctrine of *Vyāpti* originated in the Buddha rather than in the *Vaiśeṣika* school," but he adds that there is positive proof in the *Vaiśeṣika* and the *Nyāya Sūtras* and in Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* to say that the doctrine was held by *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* writers long before the times of Dīnnāga.

Apart from his contribution to Logic, it is interesting to note how he looks at the whole process of inference. He says, "*Sarvoyaṁ anumānānumeyavyavahāro buddhyārūḍhenairu dharmā-dharmibhāvena na bahiḥsadasattvam apekṣate.*" From this Keith argues that Dīnnāga declares clearly that all the relations of probans and probandum have nothing whatever to do with external reality but depend upon the intellect.¹ We can say thus that he belonged to the Idealist school of Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu, "according to which all appearances are but transformations of the principle of consciousness by its inherent movement, and none of our cognitions are produced by any external objects which to us seem to be existing outside of us and generating our ideas."²

"Dharmakīrti," writes I-Tsing, "made a further improvement in Logic (after Jina)"³. The "improvement" referred to by I-Tsing appears to be the complete formulation of the *Trairūpa* theory. In his *Nyāya-bindu* he says, *anumānam dridhā svārtham parārtham ca. Tatra svārtham liṅgādanumeya jñānam tadanumānam. Trairūpyam punar liṅgasyānumeya sattvameru. Sapakṣe sattvamevu. Asapakṣe cāsattvameva niscitam. Trairūpāṇi ca triṇyeva liṅgam*

(1) See Keith, *The Authorship of Nyāyapravesa*, I H.Q., IV, p. 19. Cf. also "For Dīnnāga, therefore, the whole of knowledge, despite its contact at one point with an unknowable reality, is made up of ideas involved in both perception and inference. These ideas are the product of our mental activity and are not created by any external cause." I. L. A., p. 102.

(2) See Surendra Nath Das Gupta, *Philosophy of Vasubandhu* in *Vimśatikā*, and *Trimśikā*, *Ibid.*, p. 36. Cf. also Śaṅkara, *Brahma Sūtra-Bhāṣya*, adhyāya II, pāda II, sūtra 28, specially the phrase "buddhyārūḍha".

(3) o.c., p. 182.

anuपालब्धिः svabhāvakaर्या ceti. Inference is of two kinds : For one's own self and for others. Inference for one's self is defined as the knowledge of the inferable derived through the reason or middle term bearing its three forms or characteristics. The three forms of the reason are the following:

- (1) The middle term must abide in the minor term.
- (2) The middle term must abide only in cases which are homologous with the major term.
- (3) The middle term must never abide in cases which are heterologous from the major term.

The three kinds of middle term are :—

- (1) Identity (*Svabhāva*).
- (2) Effect (*Kārya*).
- (3) Non-perception (*Anuपालब्धि*).¹

He does not differ in his division of inference from the Brāhmaṇ or Jain logicians. He makes a departure, however, from the latter logicians when he says that Non-perception, Identity and Causality—these three—form the marks of a syllogism. According to him, then, if, for instance, in the traditional example of fire on a hill, we can show the identity, and causal connection between fire, smoke and the hill and non-perception of the mark in any heterologous instance, we would be justified in inferring that there is fire on the hill because there is smoke.

But if the arguments that were advanced against Diṅnāga's claim to be the author of *Trairūpa* theory, were to be repeated against Dharmakīrti also, it would be difficult to say what "further improvement" Dharmakīrti made in the then existing Logic.

We would, however, like to draw the attention of Dhruva to the fact that even the contemporaries and successors of Dharmakīrti regarded Dharmakīrti as the author of the *Trairūpa*

(1) From Vidyabhusana, *History of Indian Logic*, p. 310.

theory.¹ This point will be made explicit from the fact that Pātrakesari severely criticised the *Trairūpa* theory, and he in turn was replied to by Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, two eminent pandits of Nālandā. This action on Śāntarakṣita's part is very significant. Why should he take up the challenge unless the challenge was directed against a school which he represented? This school, we think, was no other than that of Diñnāga and Dharmakīrti.

To make the point very clear we lay before the reader the charges and countercharges. Pātrakesari brought the following charge against the *Trairūpa* theory :

Anyathānūpaśāpānnavatvam yatra tatra trayeṇa kim.

Nānyathānūpaśāpānnavatvam yatra tatra trayeṇa kim.

That is to say: what is the use of the three marks where (the conclusion) can be arrived at without them? (Again) of what use are the three marks where you cannot arrive at (the conclusion) in spite of them?

And he further argues that the fallacy of *Anaikāntika* will follow if we argue with Dharmakīrti that that inference is right which is characterised by Identity, Causality and Non-perception. For instance : If from the fact that the sons of A are brown, we argue that A's future son will also be brown (*sādhyā*), because they are related as father and son, because other sons of A are also brown, because the sons of B are not brown,—even then the possibility of the son being born fair and not brown is not excluded.

To this objection Śāntarakṣita replies that the Opposition has committed a fundamental blunder by assuming a reason (*hetu*) which is no reason at all. The relation of being a son (*Tatputrattva*) is not the cause as it is neither Identity, Causality

(1) For a fuller discussion, see Pathak, *Dharmakīrti's Trilakṣaṇahetu attacked by Pātrakesari and defended by Śāntarakṣita, and Dharmakīrti and Bhāmaha*, A.B.O.R.I., XII, pp. 71-80 and 372-395 respectively, where Pathak has shown almost conclusively that Diñnāga alias Bhadanta and Dharmakīrti were the real authors of the *Trairūpa* or *Trilakṣaṇa* theory.

nor Non-perception. Invariable concomitance, therefore, is not possible, that is to say the son may be fair.¹

Through this controversy we know incidentally that the line of eminent logicians was not closed after its greatest exponent Diñnāga. But, right up to the end of about the eighth century, contribution to the development of Logic was continued and Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla were the representatives of the 8th century as Vasubandhu, Diñnāga and Dharmakīrti were of the 5th, 6th and 7th centuries respectively.

Another way in which the University tried to convey its teachings to the intelligentsia was by composition of encyclopædical works dealing with Theology, Philosophy, Logic, Grammar, etc. One such work that we are fortunate to recover is *Tattvasaṅgraha*² together with a most illuminating commentary on it called the *Pañjikā*. Śāntarakṣita wrote the text, while Kamalaśīla, his pupil, wrote the commentary. While speaking about Nālandā's contribution to the development of Logic we said that Śāntarakṣita was a famous logician of the 8th century A.D. In this work we find him and his pupil as versatile philosophers who not only survey all the past as well as the contemporary philosophical systems but even refute them one by one and thus strengthen the foundations of *Vijñānavāda* laid down by Āśaṅga.

Śāntarakṣita examines no less than 27 different systems or better 26 different schools of thought. They are:

- (1) The *Sāṃkhya*.
- (2) *Nyāya* (believing in God).
- (3) *Seśvara Sāṃkhya*.
- (4) *Svābhāvikajagadvāda* (Theory of Self-Existence).
- (5) *Śabdabrahmavāda*.
- (6) *Aupaniṣada Puruṣavāda* (Doctrine of Anthropomorphic God).

(1) I am indebted to Dr. Pathak, *Dharmakīrti's Trilakṣaṇahetu*, etc., *A. B. O. R. I.*, XII, pp. 71-81 for the citations from Pātrakesari, Dharmakīrti and Śāntarakṣita.

(2) G. O. S., No. XXX.

(7) Doctrine of Soul (of the Naiyāikas, Vaiśeṣikas, Mimāṃsakas, Sāṃkhyas, Digambara Jains, Advaitins and Vāstīputrīyas, a sect of the Buddhists).

(8) The doctrine of *Sthirabhāva* (permanent entities).

(9) The theory of *Karmaphala*, that is relation between action and its results.

(10) The doctrine of categories (of Gotama and Kaṇāda).

(11) The doctrine of Qualities.

(12) The doctrine of Action.

(13) The doctrine of Generality.

(14) The doctrine Particularity.

(15) The doctrine of Inherence.

(16) The doctrine of *Śabdārtha* (that is, the word and its corresponding object).

(17) The theory of Perception.

(18) The theory of Inference.

(19) The theories regarding other kinds of proofs, *viz.*,

(i) *Śabda* (ii) *Upamāna*, (iii) *Arthāpatti* (presumption),
 (iv) *Abhāva* (non-existence), (v) *Yuklyanuḍalabdhivicāra* (affirmative-negative inseparable connection and non-perception),
 (vi) *Saṃbhava* (probability), (vii) *Aitihyapratisabhā* (tradition and intelligence).

(20) *Syādvāda* (Doctrine of the perfect knowledge of things).

(21) *Traikālyavāda*.

(22) The *Lokāyata* doctrine.

(23) The doctrine of the external objects.

(24) The belief in *Śṛti* (Revealed Literature).

(25) The theory of Self-evidence.

(26) The doctrine of Omniscience.

In short, Śāntarakṣita takes notice of all the most important philosophies, *viz.*, the *Sāṃkhya*, *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Mimāṃsa*, *Jaina*, *Lokāyata* and lastly the *Vedānta*.

In order to acquaint the reader with the nature of these refutations as well as the style of Buddhist writers we have selected Śāntarakṣita's criticism of the *Satkāryavāda* or the doctrine that the effect is existent in the cause. Śāntarakṣita first states the doctrine of the *Sāṃkhyas*:

The *Sāṃkhyas* say that the effect is existent in the cause because of the following five reasons: (i) a thing that is non-existent cannot be produced, (ii) because of the fact that some material cause is required for producing the desired effect, (iii) because of the impossibility of everything being produced (from everything), (iv) because only those causes that are capable can produce that which is possible to produce, (v) because of the existence of the effect. Moreover, the *Sāṃkhyas* maintain that the *Pradhāna* (Primordial Matter) is the cause because of the measurability or limitations of different objects. (*Bhedānāmtu parimāṇāt*), because of the power (to produce) and the power of action (*Śaktitāḥ pravṛtteśca*); because of the distinctions between cause and effect (*Kāraṇa kārya vibhāgāt*) and lastly because of the integrity of the universal forms (*Avibhāgādvaiśvarūpyasya*).

Śāntarakṣita adduces the following arguments against the *Sāṃkhya* doctrine: Those causes which they have set forth for proving the prior existence of the effect in the cause can be adduced to prove its non-existence in the cause. He then explains how this is possible. First, if effects are already in the cause, what is there for the cause to produce? For instance, if curds are already existent in milk what is there for the milk to produce? To state it more clearly: The effect, since it is existent, is not to be produced by any cause. Hence, says Śāntarakṣita, the postulation of cause is not at all necessary, since like the other (*Puruṣa*) it cannot accomplish anything. The *Sāṃkhyas* might reply that there is something for the cause to perform, *viz.*, that it has to make the effect manifest (even though it is existent in the cause) and therefore it is not redundant. Śāntarakṣita replies: If the effect was existing formerly then the objection is not met at all. If it was not

existent how can the non-existent effect be produced from the cause? Hence as there is nothing to be performed there is no necessity of the material cause; of the assumption that certain effects can be obtained from certain fixed causes; of the assumption that only capable causes can produce things that are possible to be created; of the assumption of the activity (*of the Pradhāna*). Even the designation as 'cause' is also untenable.

In the following verses Śāntarakṣita attacks Sāṃkhya tenets from other standpoints.

He says that means of knowledge do two things; first, they remove doubt and ignorance; secondly they inspire or give correct and definite knowledge.

But this, however, is not possible in the *Satkāryavāda*. Because of the theory of prior existence neither doubt, etc., can be removed nor definite knowledge can be possible. Consequently, concludes Śāntarakṣita, the whole doctrine is thoroughly untenable. Sāṃkhyas cannot maintain that certainty which was existent is caused by means because that would compromise their position nor can they say that the means make the unmanifest manifest, because there is no increase of form because of non-distinction.

Thus neither there is the possibility of the knowledge of a thing, nor the possibility of destroying the cover which keeps back the acquiring of the object, as the object to be obtained is always there, and secondly the question of cover, etc., is impossible. He then proceeds to attack the doctrine of the Three Gunas.

As everything cannot produce everything even though all are constituted of the same three Gunas, even so everything cannot produce everything, even though the effect is non-existent.

The Sāṃkhyas might rejoin that the Buddhists—Vijñānāvādins—cannot postulate fixed powers for the causes because they assume that the objects do not exist (except in the mind).

But if they do not exist, then the principle of fixed cause will have to be accepted.

To this objection Śāntarakṣita replies: Not so. Because the external objects do not exist with us and therefore the designation of fixed cause does not come up at all. While the reality (*Vijñāna*) which is devoid of forms, of disguises, remains untouched.

(In fact) objects have no names and forms because they are nothing but mere contrivances and denotations. They are of many kinds and operate with regard to an object which has no distinctions, as they are accustomed to act.

The importance of *Tattvasaṅgraha* can never be over-estimated. Concerned as we are with the studies of Nālandā, the work is a very useful finger-post. It points to the fact that Nālandā was not only a Buddhist University, but a University in which all the subjects Buddhist as well as non-Buddhist were taught. Moreover, refutation of so many schools of thought pre-supposes a previous study of them by the teachers as well as the students, who, as we can see from Kamalaśīla's commentary, were required to explain and elucidate what their teachers said briefly and concisely.

Another most striking and wonderful feature of this encyclopædia is the reference even to the most contemporary views and their authors.¹ References, for instance, are made to Kumārila, Pātrakesari and others who were either the contemporaries of Śāntarakṣita or immediate predecessors. This is suggestive of the fact that there must be such a continuous flow of students going in and out of that Temple of Learning that its pandits could keep in touch with even the latest developments in the realm of thought. And the marvellous and far-reaching effect that could be produced by such an all embracing work like *Tattvasaṅgraha* among the Schoolmen can be better understood than expressed. It would create a new impetus to refute the charges levelled against them—resulting

(1) See *Tattvasaṅgraha*, Foreword, G. O. S., No. XXX.

in a further and deeper introspective study of their systems with a view to completely perfecting the imperfections that might have inadvertently crept in their works. It is healthy controversies of this nature that would lead to the promulgation of new ideas. And if, "it is probable that the *Tattvasaṅgraha* was written mainly to refute the arguments and theories of Kumārila and Uddyotakara", as Benoytosh Bhattacharyya says¹, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the emergence of Śaṅkara as the champion of the old Upaniṣadic *Adhyātma-vāda* was the direct outcome of such works as *Tattvasaṅgraha*. It is on account of him primarily that India, which since the time of Buddha for centuries was overridden with the doctrines of Nihilism, Non-Soul, etc., was once more made to believe that there was Soul.

The credit for all that *Tattvasaṅgraha* achieved and contributed to the development of Philosophy, Logic and other kindred subjects must be given to the University of Nālandā, for both Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla were its alumni. So to the Alma Mater must be given the glory of this encyclopædia.

Besides *Tattvasaṅgraha*, Śāntarakṣita wrote other works; some of them are given below:

1. *Vajravidāraṇināmadhāraṇītikā*.
2. *Sarvatathāgata pūrva-praṇidhāna viśeṣa vistara sūtrāntopadeśa*.
3. *Vajradhara-saṅgīta-bhagavata-stotratikā*.
4. *Aśtatathāgata stotra*.
5. *Hevajrodbhava-Kurukullayāh-panca-mahopadeśa*.

But one work which is not mentioned in the Tibetan Catalogue has been found by Dr. Bhattacharyya. It is a Tāntric work and is entitled *Tattvasiddhi*. The work formulates the doctrine of *Mahāsukhavāda*, a development of the *Vijñānavāda*.² From this work we learn definitely that the

(1) *Tattvasaṅgraha*, Foreword, o.c., pp. LXXXII-III.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. XXI.

Śāntarakṣita was a follower of Vajrayāna, because *Tattvasaṅgraha* only shows him as a *Vijñānavādi*.¹ No fitter epithet than the one given at the end of this work would apply to Śāntarakṣita's erudition and scholarship. It calls him 'Aśeṣapara sidhānta sāgarapāra,' "one who has crossed the ocean of all the manifold doctrines formulated by others." And his *Tattvasaṅgraha* truly reveals him as a man who was master of the different schools of Philosophy, Logic, Grammar, etc.

We shall close our account of the work done by Śāntarakṣita with a few remarks on his style. Śāntarakṣita writes with a charming facility and shows a wonderful mastery over the syllogistic reasoning.² From his refutation of the Sāṃkhya's *Satkāryavāda*, which we have referred to, we get an idea how he meets his opponent. He first tries to understand his position as clearly as possible or which is the other way of putting it he states the case of his opponent. This task he performs so admirably and exquisitely that any one who only reads it would think it is the Sāṃkhya himself who is arguing his case.

Equally charming and instructive are his plans of attack. He never reveals his own views. But, like an impartial tribunal, he points out mistakes and inconsistencies of his opponent's tenets.³ And gradually, he goes on to prove that if the opponent would stick to his arguments it would lead him to an absurd and ridiculous position, and then concludes that his position is thoroughly untenable even from his own point of view. With this done, we see Śāntarakṣita in the garb of a propagandist. He recounts the advantages of his own system, and says that all those faults and inconsistencies which were shown in the opponent's system would never occur in his own.

Kamalaśīla, though he was known to the Tibetans as a teacher at Nālandā of *Tantra* and Logic and as one who finally laid the roots of Tāntric Buddhism by defeating the Hoshang,

(1) *Ibid.*

(2) Cf. o.c., verse 15, p. 22.

(3) See, for instance, *Tattvasaṅgraha*, o.c., verses 17-18-19-20.

to us he appears as a great logician and philosopher primarily through his most learned commentary on the *Tattvasaṅgraha*. We shall not dilate much upon the value of his work because much that has been said of *Tattvasaṅgraha* will be true of his commentary.

However, the one distinct benefit of it (his commentary) is that Kamalaśīla has given us a complete history of philosophers and logicians by giving us the names of the authors whose views are referred to by his guru Śāntarakṣita.

After Kamalaśīla we do not meet with any famous pandits in the realm of Philosophy or Logic till we come to the eleventh century when we meet Dīpamkara Śrīñāna, a pandit equally famous as Śāntarakṣita. But as he belonged more to the sister University of Vikramāśīla we do not speak of the part he played in the spread of Buddhist culture.

It appears from the records of Hiuen Tsiang's biographer and also of I-Tsing that there was an astronomical observatory at Nālandā and that Astronomy formed part of the students' curriculum. Hwui Li, for instance, says, "The observatories seem to be lost in the vapours (of the morning) and the upper rooms tower above the clouds."¹ And if we now read the above remark with the following: "From the windows one may see how the winds and clouds (produce new forms) and the soaring eaves the conjunctions of the sun and the moon (may be observed)"² then two interpretations are possible. Either the words are a poetic description of the beauty and grandeur of the place; or they signify, as Havell thinks, that Nālandā was a royal observatory.³ His supposition is also based on another fact, namely, that Nālandā had a Clepsydra, or a water-clock which according to Hiuen Tsiang, says he, gave correct time for all Magadha.⁴

(1) o.c., p. 111.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilisation*, p. 141.

(4) *Ibid.* Havell seems to be wrong in attributing the statement to Hiuen Tsiang, for nowhere in Hiuen Tsiang's or his biographer's records can we trace the remark. It is I-Tsing, however, who gives a detailed

From references in Tibetan works to Nālandā as a great centre of Tāntric studies, or to a person as a professor of *Tantra* at Nālandā,¹ and also from a number of books, evidently Tāntric, ascribed to the pandits of Nālandā in the Chinese,² it would appear that *Tantra* was, perhaps, a very popular subject with the students as well as professors in the Nālandā University.³ Now it would have been sufficient only to have observed that *Tantra* was taught at Nālandā, and to have mentioned a few books written by the Nālandā pandits, were it not for the fact that *Tantra* and the whole cult which goes under the name of Tāntrism is even after the publication of many works on it, regarded as “gibberish”.⁴ For references, as the one above quoted, cast a slur, even though incidently, on the education that was given by the Nālandā University. In order, therefore, to decide or to come to any conclusion on the value of Nālandā education it is thought desirable to give a short history, and nature of the *Tantras* or better of the cult, that goes under the name of Tāntrism or Tāntricism.

Tāntrism, particularly that which was prevalent at Nālandā, had its origin amongst the various religious and even philosophical practices that were followed by the Hindus as well as Buddhists. It had something to do with religion and not anything else. This much is conceded by all. But the question is, what is Tāntrism actually? and in what period of Indian history did it spring up? These, however, are the most difficult questions to decide. Winternitz, for instance, says,

description of a clepsydra, and its working at Nālandā. See o.c., pp. 144-146. Cf. also the following words from *Nan-hae-k'i-kwei-nin-fa-ch'uen*, Beal, *J.R.A.S.*, XIII (N. S.), p. 571. “This is the only temple in which, by Imperial order, a water clock is kept to determine the right time.”

(1) Kamalaśila was a professor of *Tantras*. Vidyabhusana, *H.I.L.*, p. 327.

(2) *Catalogue du fond Tibetain.*

(3) We have even epigraphical evidence to show that Nālandā was a renowned centre of Tāntric studies. We are told by the Nālandā copperplate of Devapāladeva (11.37-42, *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, p. 325.) that “Nālandā was the abode of *bhikṣus* and Bodhisattvas well-versed in the *Tantras*”.

(4) Winternitz, *I.H.Q.*, IX, No. 1, March, 1933, p. 4.

“The term ‘*Tantra*’ ought to be restricted to the texts connected with Śakti worship. Tantra texts in this sense cannot be proved to have existed before the 7th century, though some of the elements constituting the *Tantras* may have existed before that time.”¹ Speaking of the elements of the *Tantras*, he says, “Some of these may be traced as far back as the times of the *Yajurveda*, where we already find the use of mystic syllables and words, which play such an important part in the Mantras of Tāntric works. Magic also which is one of the elements of Tantra literature, of course, reaches back to the *Atharvaveda*. But there is no line of ‘evolution’ from *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda* to the *Tantras*”.

Bhattacharyya, on the other hand, holds that “the seeds of Tāntric Buddhism were already there in the original Buddhism in the form of *Mudrās*, *Mantras*, *Mandalas*, *Dhāraṇīs*, *Yoga*, and *Samādhi*, as a means to attain happiness and prosperity in this world.”² These elements, together with some of the changes that took place in Buddhism, from time to time, were responsible according to him, for the actual origin of Tāntrism.

Before we review these changes that Bhattacharyya speaks of, we must needs know, in short, what exactly the nature of Tāntrism was.

Tāntrism was a form of Buddhsm which unlike the primitive Buddhism, advocated recital of *Mantras* and *Dhāraṇīs*, practice of *Yoga* and *Samādhi*, and lastly worship not only of Buddha in different *Mudrās* but even worship of a host of gods and goddesses. Some of its features which are severely criticised were such pestilent dogmas and practices as quoted below.³

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 8.

(2) See *Two Vajrayāna works*, G.O.S., No. XLIV, Introduction, p. X.

(3) मातृभगिनीपुर्तीश्च कामयेद्यस्तु साधकः

स सिद्धिं विपुलं गच्छेत् महायानाग्रधर्मताम् ।

मातरं बुद्धस्य विभोः कामयन्न च लिप्यते

सिद्ध्यते तस्य बुद्धत्वं निर्विकल्पस्य धीमतः ॥

For other practices see *Two Vajrayāna Works*, o.c., p. 23.

Though Buddhism had spread well in the time of Buddha himself, still continuous efforts were made after his death to make it still more acceptable to the people, because on its philosophical as well as religious side, Buddhism was found wanting. To improve it philosophically, Aśvaghoṣa gave a new interpretation of *Nirvāṇa*¹. Nāgārjuna introduced his theory of *Śūnya*²—and incidentally Mahāyāna—while Vijnānavādins under Maitreyanāth supplemented the element of *Vijñāna*, a positive element, in the original conception of the *Śūnya*, which was pure vacuity. The masses still remained dissatisfied. For even though they led a strictly moral life, and renounced all the pleasures of life, still nothing—not even these new philosophical ideas of *Śūnyavādins* and *Vijnānavādins*—could assure the masses that they would enable them to attain cessation from the birth circle and escape from misery.

To satisfy the people on this point, two new doctrines were introduced into Buddhism. These were the *Mahāsukhavāda* and the doctrine of *Karuṇā*. Unlike the previous doctrines—*Śūnyavāda* and *Vijnānavāda*—which were primarily philosophical—these were religious. The followers of the former (*Mahāsukha*) satisfied the masses by holding out a promise that even when *Nirvāṇa* is attained there remains something which is *Vijñāna* and continues to remain in eternal bliss and happiness. The *Śūnya*, they said, is *Nirālmā* and the *Bodhicitta* or Bodhimind, when emancipated plunges itself in *Śūnya* or in the embrace of *Nirālmā* and remains there in eternal bliss and happiness.

But it was the doctrine of *Karuṇā* that satisfied the masses most. According to this doctrine the Bodhisattva should sacrifice everything, his personal happiness and even his own merits for the suffering humanity. He must strive

(1) See Aśvaghoṣa, *Saundarānanda Kāvya*, referred to by Bhattacharyya, *A Peep into the Later Buddhism*, A.B.O.R.I., X, p. 2-3.

(2) Cf. His definition of *Nirvāṇa* as a condition of mind about which neither existence nor non-existence nor a combination of the two nor a negation of the two can be predicted, expressed in Sanskrit as *astināsti tadubhayānubhayacatus kotivinirmuktam*.

hard through a continuous chain of births and rebirths for the emancipation of his fellow beings.¹

Thus the Buddhists got what up to now they lacked. Through the cult of Bodhisattva and Avalokiteśvara, a personal god was being slowly introduced into Buddhism, though we have nothing to say against the theory of *Karuṇā* itself. It was, on the contrary, lofty, noble, and ennobling. And, as Dr. Bhattacharyya has rightly said, "The idea of *Karuṇā* is unique in the history of any religion and Buddhism can well be proud of it."²

But sheltered behind this lofty ideal—specially under the doctrine of *Mahāsukhavāda*—as we shall show later on—the priesthood committed and encouraged some very gross and hideous acts of immorality in the name of religion. And sanction for many of the uncommon and grossly immoral practices was found by the misrepresentation and misuse of these doctrines of *Karuṇā* and *Mahāsukhavāda*.

With a view to find easy acceptance among the people for these views—which were in a sense against the teaching of primaevial Buddhism—their propounders found out a novel way. They preached them in the form of *Saṅgīties*.³ Almost all *Tantras* are in this form and are said to have been delivered by Buddha in an Assembly of the Faithful. Thus in a secret yet in a way that was believed to be authoritative, the *Tantras* and their many practices—good and bad—were handed down from the guru to the śiṣya, till they gradually crept in among the people.

(1) The doctrine of *Karuṇā* was perhaps, first, preached in the *Sukhā:atīvṛyūha*, a work of about the first century B.C. It was commented upon by Nāgārjuna in his *Daśabhūmiwibhāṣāśastra*. The doctrine was fully evolved in works like *Kāraṇḍavyūha* etc. See MaxMüller, *Sukhā-vativṛyūha*, pp 5-6-7 and p. XIX, also *Kāraṇḍarīyūha*, pp. 21, 22, 84.

(2) *A Peep into the Later Buddhism*, A.B.O.R.I., X, p. 6.

(3) *Saṅgīti* is the name of a form of Buddhist literature wherein in the very opening lines Buddha is introduced in an Assembly of the Faithful in monasteries well-connected with the life of Buddha. In Tāntric *Saṅgīties*, however, Buddha is introduced in an assembly of women. See Bhattacharyya, *A.B.O.R.I.*, X, p. 5; also *Guhyasaṃāja Tantra*, G.O.S., LIII, Introduction.

Another reason why Tāntrism and Tāntric practices were easily accepted by the Buddhists was that this new cult allowed a liberty of action which was forbidden by the early Buddhism.¹

Other circumstances were also favourable for the rise of Tāntrism. From very early times belief in superstition, magic and sorcery was prevalent in India. Even Buddha seems to have believed in miraculous powers for we find him in the *Vinaya Texts* scolding his disciples for making an unwarranted use of his powers.² So when Tāntrism with its various sorts of *Mantras*, *Dhāraṇīs*, and other practices held forth miraculous powers it was readily seized upon by the people.

To sum up, therefore, the cause of the rise of Tāntrism: It was mainly due to the two inherent defects in Buddhism:

- (1) It did not offer a suitable and convincing and at the same time popular explanation of *Nirvāṇa*, which was the goal of all Buddhists. Consequently in trying to remedy this, and to find out newer explanations, ideas of *Mahāsukha*, etc., crept in, which brought about the moral enervation visible in the Tāntric Age.
- (2) There was a revolt against the strict and unnatural discipline enjoined upon his followers by Buddha which was given sanction as it were by the doctrines of *Mahāsukha* and *Karuṇā*, according to which salvation was not incompatible with indulgence in worldly pleasures.
- (3) Suitable ground for the spread of Tāntrism was found in the existence of belief in superstition, magic, sorcery, etc.

(1) Revolts against the moral code are visible even in the *Vinaya-pitaka*. For a similar revolt—but of a much stronger kind—the Mahā-saṅghikas were expelled from the Church by the Sthaviras who refused to yield on the morel question and make any relaxation in the code.

(2) *Mahāvagga*, V, 1.5.7; VI, 34.1, 2.

It is very difficult to say when this phase of Buddhism actually arose. It began to assert itself and became a living faith in about the 7th century A.D., though traditionally its first promulgation is attributed to Āśāṅga, who flourished in about the 3rd or 4th century A.D.¹ Tibetan opinion definitely tells us that Tāntrism is of very ancient origin, and was transmitted in the most secret manner² from the time of Āśāṅga down to the time of Dharmakīrti.³ Waddell, too, holds the same view.⁴

Some scholars believe that *Sukhāvatiryūha*, *Mañjuśrimūlkalpa*, *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, etc., are the earliest works which speak of Tāntric practices.⁵ It is, however, in the *Guhyasamāja* that we find the full and complete statement of Tāntrism. It is here that we meet with a systematic treatment of the *Mantras*, with the theory of *Karuṇā* (and how it was used by the Bodhisattvas to get emancipation for the people by the practice of five *makāras* and other prohibited rites),—with a full explanation of the theory of Dhyāni Buddhas⁶—which was in a sense the central theme of Tāntrism,—and many other details which are associated with Tāntrism.

From a reading of the *Guhyasamāja* and the *Sādhana-mālā*, it would appear that the sole aim of the Tāntrics was to obtain *Siddhi* which is defined as the “attainment of super-human powers of the mind, body or the sense organs.”⁷

(1) See above, Chap. II, p. 19, n. 5.

(2) The reason why it was handed down secretly from guru to śiṣya down to Dharmakīrti is to be found in the fact that Tāntric practices could not be performed openly and publicly because they violated all the rules of conduct and discipline prescribed by Buddha while in the seventh century it passed into the hands of such bold men as Indrabhuti, Saraha and Padmasambhava who were not afraid to preach them publicly.

(3) Taranath, o.c., p. 201.

(4) *Lamāism*, pp. 14-15.

(5) Winternitz, however, says that *Mañjuśrimūlkalpa* is not very ancient; its final redaction may have taken place between the 8th and the 10th centuries A.D. See *I.H.Q.*, IX, No. 1, 1933, p. 5.

(6) The theory is explained in the appendix.

(7) Of the five varieties of the *Siddhi* Janmaja, Tapoja, Samādhija, and Auṣadhija, the Buddhists were concerned mainly with the Mantraja

Apart from these ideal achievements, the Sādhaka, as it appears from the numerous *Sādhanas*, was anxious to have emancipation be it either from ordinary earthly ills—diseases etc.,—or from this wordly life.¹

The *Sādhanas* and their *Mantras*, however, could not be recited by any one who liked to do so. The prospective Tāntric must be properly initiated into the Tāntric practices through the right channel—viz. the guru. And no ordinary guru would do. He, in fact, must possess all the qualifications laid down in the Tāntric works.² His duty was to initiate the śiṣya, to give him different kinds of *abhiṣeka*, and then instruct him how to achieve the *Siddhis*.³ Likewise only that student could approach the guru for the knowledge of the *Siddhis* and Tāntric practices who had the requisite qualities.⁴

We are not concerned here with the various inconsistencies that appear in these rules. But we may note here that

or magic syllables. Moreover the *Siddhis* of the Buddhists were somewhat different from the eight *Siddhis* acknowledged by the Hindus. With the Buddhists the eight *Siddhis* are: Khaḍga, Añjana, Pādalepa, Antardhāna, Rasa Rasāyana, Khecāra, Bhūcara, and Pātāla. Dr. Bhattacharyya has tried to give an explanation of these and we shall repeat it here. (Bhattacharyya, *Sādhanamālā*, II, Intro. p. LXXXV.)

The *first* signifies the perfection which enables a man to conquer battle with the help of a sword (on which *mantras* have) been muttered. The *second* evidently means the magic unguent which enables the wearer to perceive the treasures buried under the earth or otherwise hidden from the eyes. The *third* refers to the mysterious ointment which when applied to legs enables a man to move about everywhere without his body being perceived by anybody. The *fourth* refers to the mysterious power which enables a man to disappear miraculously before the very eyes of other people. The *fifth* probably refers to the magic solution which turns baser metals into gold, or the medicine which gives immunity from death. The *sixth* is the power which enables one to move in the firmament. The *seventh* gives one power to go at will anywhere in the world in a moment. The *eighth* refers to the power of going to the other worlds.

(1) See *Sādhanamālā*, a.c., p. LXXXIII.

(2) See *Two Vajrayāna Works*, G.O.S., No. XLIV, pp. 71-72.

(3) The guru occupied such a high position in Vajrayāna (more popular name of Tāntrism) that he was idolised as Buddha, Sugata, and Dharmakāya. Even the bestowal of emancipation lay in his power.

(4) See *Two Vajrayāna Works*, pp. 73-74. Cf. also *Arya Mañjuśrimūlakalpa*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. LXX, p. 92.

what on a superficial reading seems to be inconsistencies perhaps refers to the different kinds of pupils corresponding to the fourfold division of the *Tantras*.¹

“The Mantras”, as Dr. Bhattacharyya has rightly said, “constitute the back-bone of Tāntric worship and of Vajrayāna”. They are of innumerable varieties, such as Bīja, Hṛdaya, Pūjā, etc. Mostly they are meaningless syllables. We can hardly say with certainty who introduced these in Buddhism, though Vajrayānists attribute their promulgation to Buddha himself. Whoever be the originator, it seems that the *Mantras* of Vajrayāna are a development of the *Dhāraṇīs*. According to Kern, these *Dhāraṇīs* seemed to have been introduced into Buddhism for the benefit of the less cultured followers who did not care so much for the *Nirvāṇa* as they did for the material prosperity in this world. We can trace the evolution of the *Mantras* from the *Dhāraṇīs* and even earlier works by examining only one Tāntric work, namely, *Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. This voluminous work was first reduced to the *Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya Sūtra*. The *Sūtra* was further reduced to the *Prajñāpāramitā Dhāraṇī*. From the *Dhāraṇī* we had a *Prajñāpāramitā Mantra*. But even this small *Mantra* was substituted by the conception of a Bīja in one syllable ‘*Pranī*’ in response to which the *Sūnya* transformed itself in the form of the goddess Prajñāpāramitā. “The origin of the Tāntric Mantra thus” says Bhattacharyya,

(1) Scholars are not unanimous as to the number of subdivisions of the *Tantras*. Indian scholars know only of four subdivisions, viz., (1) Kriyātantra, (2) Caryātantra, (3) Yogatantra, (4) Anuttarayogatantra. But Kazi Dawsam Dup gives us a sixfold classification of Vajrayāna. To the list above set forth, he adds two more: (i) Mahāyogatantra and (ii) Atiyogatantrayāna. Freshers into the Vajrayāna doctrine were admitted in the Kriyātantra, the lowest of all the Yānas. Here they were required to observe strict rules of discipline and celibacy. In the Yogatantra they were given more latitude in their conduct and were allowed to mix with the Śaktis; while immunity from all restrictions, moral and others was granted to those who were promoted to the Anuttara, the highest of all the Yānas. Those who were lucky and capable of reaching this lofty level were called Siddhas, persons who had obtained miraculous powers.

“can be traced through the successive stages of the Buddhist literature.”¹

To the Vajrayānists these *Mantras* were like Kāmadhenu, repetition of which according to certain rules would give them earthly and unearthly powers. In fact it was maintained by some that there was nothing impossible for the *Mantras* to perform.²

Dhāraṇīs, *Mantras*, and so forth, all essential elements of Tāntrism, had brought in their trail, the worship of numerous gods and goddesses. Tāntrism, or Vajrayāna, in fact, had a regular pantheon of its own. But we do not refer to it here because that would take us beyond our scope. However, a reference is made to some of the gods and goddesses in the Chapter on “Ritualism of Nālandā Buddhism.”

Likewise, the division of the whole *Tantra* literature into Buddhist and Brāhmaṇic and a few specimens of each, and other less important features of the *Tantras*, are given in the appendix as they are not directly connected with our subject.

The task of assigning values to things is the most difficult part that one has to perform while dealing with them in their different aspects. And it is made all the more difficult when this phase of Buddhism, namely Tāntrism, has been condemned in the most scathing language and run down with such phrases as “meaningless”, “charlatanism” and “degeneracy” by critics Oriental as well as Occidental. It is therefore difficult to keep one’s mind unaffected by such contemptuous expressions and have a proper and just appreciation of the Tāntric culture.

Moreover, we are concerned with the educative value of Tāntrism, and, therefore we must see for ourselves if the students of Nālandā were given the worst education that was

(1) Adapted with necessary changes from Bhattacharyya, *Sādhana-mālā*, II, Intro., pp. LXVI-VIII.

(2) किमस्त्यसाध्यं मन्त्राणां योजितानां यथाविधि ।

referred to by Bhattacharyya, *Ibid.*, p. LXIX; also *Taitvasaṅgraha*, o. c., p. 575.

possible as it would obviously come to, if we are to trust the criticism hitherto made of Tāntrism. We have to approach it, therefore, with great caution.

Avalon has struck a right note, indeed, when he says, "If they (doctrines and practices) are meaningless to them (western authors), it is because they do not know the meaning. ... Nevertheless the true spirit of scholarship will endeavour to be just, and if any doctrine or practice is not understood, it is better and safer to admit that ignorance than to allege meaninglessness and absurdity."¹

With these words of caution, then, we shall embark upon the evaluation of Tāntric culture and see how far the charges levelled against Tāntrism are true.

In any inquiry of this kind there are certain rules by which we are to be guided.

First and the most important is: we must not judge the thing from our criterion, from our modern standard of looking at things but from the criterion of the age to which the thing under question belongs. Secondly, we must clearly distinguish between the aims and the means employed to achieve them, and not confuse the latter with the former, because thus only shall we be able to apportion impartially credit and blame.

Aims of the Tāntrics, as we have already seen, varied from the highest and noblest conception of human mind to the most debased ones.

There was the desire to be one with the Infinite or as the Vajrayānist would say to unite with the Universal Śūnya, to be omniscient, or as it was the avowed declaration of the Avalokiteśvara and his followers, the Bodhisattvas, to free humanity from its continual pangs, to break its chain of birth and death

(1) *Tāntrik Texts*, Vol. VII, Foreword, pp. IV-V.

We may also note Tucci's remarks. He says, "Tantras are one of the highest expressions of Indian mysticism which may appear to us rather strange in its outward form, chiefly because we do not always understand the symbolical language in which they are written." *J.A.S.B.*, N.S., XXVI, 1930, p. 128.

and offer eternal peace. To the man standing on a lower sphere of mental development, knowledge of the *Śāstras*, obtained without much trouble, appeared as a goal, while the Tāntric student of a still inferior calibre, longed to get miraculous powers, to ward off disease and sickness, to gain earthly comforts—perhaps the most common and yet the most trivial, the company of young and beautiful *apsaras*.

There were thus, as Avalon¹ has said, two kinds of aims, namely, esoteric and exoteric, which had correspondingly two sorts of sādhakas—devotees—the spiritual few and the masses.

There is not a single object, perhaps, with the exception of the last, regarding which a word of contempt can be used, because even the longing to possess miraculous powers is in itself not bad. And for a Tāntric it was not ordinarily possible to gain miraculous powers. Intense meditation and supreme control over the sense organs coupled with other practices enabled him to attain these powers. And it will be conceded that to get control over our senses and concentrate with undivided attention is not very easy. Moreover, to repeat a hundred and thousand or a lakh times accurately and without any mistake presupposes tremendous patience in the devotee.

When we take all these facts into consideration we think scholars in past have been too strict and biased as regards their criticism of Tāntric culture. Only if they had looked impartially to the aims which the Tāntrics cherished and the hardship they underwent to attain these they would have done some justice to this unknown subject of an unknown period of the history of Indian thought.

May be they were justified in criticising the culture wholesale because of the grossness and hideousness of some of the practices preached by the doctrine.

In this case too we think that a proper and unbiased examination of some of the means employed would vindicate Tāntrism of some of the serious charges levelled against it.

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. IV-VII. We shall give below in detail the true explanation of aims and means given by him.

As has been pointed out by Avalon, Vajrayāna often speaks of the Union of Prajñā and Upāya which is nothing but Karuṇā. The former is represented as a female in close embrace with the Upāya as male. Now this is nothing but symbolism as we shall show by citing a Tantra MS. But the want of correct knowledge on the part of some of the critics, thus conveyed that Tāntrism taught nothing but sex worship. And they were right to some extent in their interpretation, because this very symbolism, in later days of Tāntrism, in the hands of baser and degraded minds, connoted nothing but the apparent meaning with the most serious consequences that they did and preached as they thought. Now before passing on to the discussion of other means we shall just refer to what the true meaning of this symbolism is.

Prajñopāya means 'with knowledge', i.e., the Means produced by knowledge. What does 'Upāya' or 'Means' signify? It signifies universal compassion, as the asset of Vajrasattva with a strong and stable form. Upāya signifies this form. Upāya is Vajrasattva, who is identified with five elements and the five Tathāgatas and who is endowed with the attributes of expansion and contraction. It is embraced by knowledge (Prajñā)—the thunderbolt entering the lotus. A devotee should think of knowledge as non-dual. This is Prajñopāya. What is the relation between the two? The five senses with five presiding deities pertain to the nature of the five elements and they are all reduced to the form of Void; the Upāya is also Vajrasattva, he stands for all entities strong and stable, he also is reduced to the form of Void. The two letters OM and Hum represent non-duality. Vajrasattva is never two, but he has assumed the form of duality simply to illustrate the Union of Prajñopāya. If he were really two, then void would be joined to void (which is absurd).¹ Avalon's interpretation is also worth noting. He says, "Shūnyatā is associated with Karuṇā. The latter is the Power, Means (Upāya) or Method by which anything is done as compared with the Wisdom (Prajñā),

(1) Shastri, *Catalogue, Nepal*, II, Preface, pp. XIII-XIV.

which guides and utilises it. Prajñā utilises Upāya in order that Nirvāṇa may be attained. The Mahāyāna Buddhist does not seek liberation for himself alone. His object is that all beings may share that lot; a truly noble doctrine. In and for the purpose of worship, Wisdom is regarded as female and Power or Method as male. They are pictured as being in sexual union, the Male standing and the Female clinging to him with either one or both lower limbs circling his back. This denotes that Wisdom and Method are ever in union.”¹

It would be evident that what superficially suggests immoral practices, in truth contains the most abstruse philosophy. And what we may be inclined to dismiss as meaningless ritualism, was of great significance to the true Tāntric.

To a lesser degree it is true of all the practices preached by *Guhyasamāja*. To the devotee who has gained perfect control over his senses, who has risen above such distinctions as “This is mine,” “This is yours,” to whom mother, sister, or wife or any woman appear all equal, Tāntrism allowed him to do whatever he liked. Therefore what appears as the most outrageous practice, as nothing but the grossest of immorality—the Tāntrics took it as quite innocent.

But here we must desist. For the rank and the file of the Tāntrics, for the masses this would be too much to understand. And these means, perhaps representations of very high thoughts and sometimes symbolic, were the causes of the degradation of the system. The ignorant masses took the things on their face-value and thus the most hideous acts of immorality were committed by the Tāntrics.

Undoubtedly, Vajrayāna, in its later and popular phases, degenerated into something undesirable but that is no reason why it should be condemned outright. As Dr. Bhattacharyya has rightly observed, “Vajrayāna took into account all the good things, tenets, philosophical notions and theories, and incorporated all that was best in Buddhism and probably in

(1) *Tāntrik Texts*, Foreword, p. XIV.

Hinduism also, and it was owing to this that it attained great popularity. It satisfied everybody, the cultured and the uncultured, the pious and the habitual sinners, the lower and the higher ranks of people and devotees."¹

We shall close our valuation of Tāntrism with what Avalon thinks of the aims and means of the Tāntrics and his opinion of the system as a whole. He is writing in the same tone as we just cited. "It is a commonplace however, which is nevertheless to be remembered," says he, "that in all religions there is a mass religion suitable to the less developed minds of the majority of the community and the religion of the highly educated, the spiritually developed, and sages. There is thus a high philosophic Tāntricism and that of the crowd with its cruder beliefs. Whilst the adherents of the former are blamed for 'their sublime vacuity and indifference to earthly claims,' the majority are called to book for making religion a means to secure material gain—as if man all the world over did not seek and pray for earthly benefits. . . . In the philosophic presentment and its accompanying ritual, the idea of the Void (Shūnyatā) dominates. After the Chelā has gained a clear vision of the Devatās occupying the different parts of the Mandala of worship he arrives at a point in which the Devatās gradually melt the one into the other, and are all absorbed in the principal Devatā which occupies the centre of the Mandala and this in its turn gradually effaces itself and is absorbed in the Bindu between the eye-brows (Ājna-Chakra) where is the Point of Light which itself disappears into the Void. . . Thus the Sādhaka is made to *practically* realise that as he is one with all that is, and that all is at base Shūnyatā.

It is not enough theoretically to affirm that identity. Proof must be given of it; and the only real proof anywhere is direct (Pratyakṣa) experience. So to take another instance; the mass of Buddhistic believers may think that Union with

the Dākinīs consists in gaining the favour of female-spirits. Esoterically however the adept projects his creative will into the Matrix of the Mother Energies which are the Mātris and Dākinīs and there engenders active forms and powers which are indeed himself as such, since all that is without is within. And so also the Buddhas project the Bodhisattvas who create in their turn. But besides all this mysticism which, whether rightly founded or not, is as a system, philosophically profound, there are to be found amongst Buddhist and Indian Tāntrikas inferior practitioners given over to an evil magic which is yet by no means always 'charlatanism', as most orientalists aver, and to abuses in connection with what in India is known as the Chakra ritual. The ignorant lay-folk in these and other countries envisage spiritual truths, so grossly that they come to be called superstition. All evil and ignorance is so much by its nature on the surface and affords so apt a subject for adverse judgment that it is readily seized upon, and the more so that it is convenient material for religious polemic. Nevertheless I repeat that we must do credit both to our intelligence and sense of justice by endeavouring to understand any religion in its highest and truest aspect. The Tantras, whether Buddhist or Indian, contain both a profound doctrine and a wonderfully conceived praxis."¹

Tāntric culture, therefore, though it will not compare favourably with and much less surpass the Upaniṣadic, because the latter taught nothing but the realization of the Immortal Soul by means which were as ideal, noble and elevating as the goal itself, still when compared with other cultures, it will not go down in the scale, as the goal it set before its followers was not intrinsically inferior to any other culture. It had in mind no other object than to gain spiritual power by supreme concentration and meditation—in short by the various practices of *Yoga*, and the Tāntric practices in a sense began where those of the *Yoga* ended.

(1) *Tāntrik Texts*, Foreword, pp. V-VII.

The University of Nālandā, then, can hardly be blamed for teaching Tāntrism. For there was nothing fundamentally wrong in the subject itself. And whatever harm was done by Tāntrism to Indian culture, was due to the misguided intellect of some of the followers of Tāntrism.

From the foregoing pages it is evident that almost all the branches of knowledge then known were taught at Nālandā. But of all these, Theology or better religio-philosophical knowledge was the most popular. And the University, besides preaching it far and wide, had even contributed considerably towards its advancement. This advancement was no other but the one we have just discussed, namely, Tāntrism. And not only did Tāntrism further this knowledge, but even opened up a new field hitherto unknown to its students, namely, Art and Iconography. For the finds at Nālandā have brought to light innumerable images which we know were created according to the description given in the *Mantras* or *Sādhanas*. This aspect of Nālandā-education thus gave rise to a new school of art called the Pālā or the Nālandā-Art. It however requires a separate chapter.

The value of Nālandā-education is discussed in the Chapter on "Student-life", as it logically comes after the topic "Aims and Prospects of Students" which is dealt with in that Chapter.

CHAPTER V

FAMOUS PANDITS OF NĀLANDĀ

ALL institutions, it is said, are extended shadows of great men. The lives of these men, therefore, are no less important than the institutions of which they are the makers. Nālandā, likewise, was the extended shadow of its pandits Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, Diññāga, Śāntarakṣita, for instance. Personal history of these and other famous pandits of the University, then, forms the topic of this Chapter.

Before dealing with this aspect of their life we would just like to add a note on the word 'Pandita' which we will use, frequently, hereafter. It was used in a two-fold sense at Nālandā. Ordinarily it meant a professor. But there was another meaning and that was of greater importance. At the University of Vikramaśilā (800 A.D.) 'Pandita' was a degree that was conferred on its successful candidates, while at Nālandā, it appears that it was a distinctive title bestowed upon the head of the University.¹

We have said previously that even though Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva were connected with Nālandā, as statements of Hiuen Tsiang would appear to show, still they cannot be said to have any real connexion with the University. For the University itself was of a posthumous origin. So also would be with Rahulabhadra, "who held office as a teacher in Śri Nālandā when King Śri Candra erected 14 fragrant halls and 14 incomparable religious schools."² Likewise, even Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu will have to be excluded from the list of

(1) See Vidyabhusana, o. c., p. 79; *H.I.L.*, p. 271-2. Tāranāth also seems to use the word in this latter sense when he says, "Dharmapāla became Pandita in Śri Nālandā after the excellent Candrakīrti," o. c., p. 161.

(2) Vidyabhusana, o.c., p. 146.

pandits who actually lived and worked in the University if we agree with Kimura¹ that they lived in 390-400 A.D., that is, some 50 years before the rise of the University. But against this we have very strong evidence to prove that they lived not only when the University was actually founded but some 60 years after. It has been shown almost conclusively by Takakusu that Āśāṅga and Vasubandhu lived in the latter part of the fifth century A.D.² The only other difficulty in including them among the pandits of Nālandā is that they might not have proceeded to Nālandā but accomplished all their work either at Peshawar (Puruṣapura) or Ayodhyā, as the University had just come into existence. The difficulty, however, will be to a great extent solved if we presume that Vasubandhu who took such a prominent part in converting Bālāditya (Narasimhagupta) to Buddhism must also be taking a very great interest in the institutions at Nālandā.

Most probably as a sign of his conversion to Buddhism, Bālāditya may have erected the great *sāṅghārāma* at Nālandā, which bore his name, even when Hiuen Tsiang visited the place.³ It is also not unlikely that Vasubandhu was greatly instrumental in persuading the king to show his love for Buddhism in a tangible shape in the form of the Nālandā buildings. To all these proofs, we may add one more, *viz.*, Taranath, who in this case, contrary to that in the case of Nāgārjuna, is supported by other historical evidence. Says he of Āśāṅga, "He lived in the period of his later life for 12 years in Nālandā."⁴ The words "later life" are important, because the greater portion of his life was spent at Peshawar and Ayodhyā,⁵ while the last years of his must have been spent in Nālandā.

(1) Kimura, o.c., p. 175.

(2) Takakusu, *Paramartha's Life of Vasubandhu*, J. R. A. S., 1905 p. 35. See also note 5, p. 19 above.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 173; Hwui Li, o.c., p. 109.

(4) Taranath, o.c., p. 118.

(5) Takakusu, o.c., pp. 35-44.

So, there is no objection, if we speak⁴ of Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu as the pandits of Nālandā, which was very fortunate in securing the services of such eminent personalities at its very inception.

The University found another great pandit in the person of Diṅnāga. Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu made the University famous by placing their services at its altar. Diṅnāga restored its fame when it was on the point of being humiliated by the Brāhmaṇ Sudūrjaya. The circumstances under which Diṅnāga was brought to Nālandā according to Taranath were as follows: A great contest took place between the pandits of Nālandā and the Brāhmaṇ Sudūrjaya. The former found it hard to discuss with the Brāhmaṇ, who was well-versed in dialectics. So they sent for Diṅnāga. Diṅnāga, though a native of Siṁha Vaktra, a suburb of Kāñcī, in the South, at the time when he was sent for by the pandits of Nālandā was living in a cave on Bhoraśaila in Odivisa. And the story goes that he thrice defeated the *Tīrthyas* in the debate. After the controversy was over, he began to preach the *Abhidhamma*; he also composed many dialectical *śāstras* and is said to have composed in all 100 *śāstras*.¹ Reference to his important works and his contribution to Logic we have noted previously.

Ever since the Chinese and Japanese came to know of him and his works, they have looked upon him with great admiration. “And even up to the present day Diṅnāga has a firm hold on the learned people of China and Japan, in spite of the fact that there had been many distinguished Naiyāyikas in both China and Japan. And as European system of Logic has been only recently introduced, Diṅnāga is still studied.”² There is a difference of opinion as to when he lived. Keith says, “He lived probably before A.D. 400.”³ While the

(1) Taranath, o.c., p. 132.

(2) I am indebted for this information to Sastri, *History of Nyāya-śāstra from Japanese sources*, J. A. S. B., N.S., I (1905), p. 177.

(3) Keith, o.c., p. 484.

Japanese would place him between 400-500 A.D.¹ This latter appears to be the more correct date because we have assigned the fifth century to Vasubandhu, Diññāga, who came after him, must necessarily be assigned 500 or even 520 to 600 A.D.

Perhaps, next to Diññāga when King Śīla was ruling, Jayadeva had the distinction to occupy the 'Pandita' chair. Save Taranath,² nobody refers to this Jayadeva, not even Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing, who though give a host of names of the famous pandits of Nālandā.

Candrakīrti succeeded Jayadeva. Of him Taranath says that he was a great Master of Masters. As the 'Pandita' of Nālandā Chandrakīrti composed commentaries upon *Mādhyamikamūla*, *Mādhyamikāvacāra* and upon First Principles.³

Before we come to Dharmapāla, who had retired just before Hiuen Tsiang visited Nālandā, the interregnum that is marked in Taranath's history was perhaps filled up by Gunamati and Sthiramati, 'the streams of whose superior teaching' had spread abroad, and Prabhāmitra and Jinamitra who had been famous for their eloquent and clear discourses and others.⁴

Of this group of distinguished pandits of the Nālandā University, we would like to speak in detail of Sthiramati, because Hiuen Tsiang in another place speaks of him as the founder of a monastery at Valabhi.⁵ Let us again repeat what Hiuen Tsiang⁶ speaks of him. He says, "The streams of whose superior knowledge spread abroad even now." Since, in the *Catalogue du fond Tibétain*, a large number of books are ascribed to him, we may construe the word "abroad" as referring to Tibet. If this can be conclusively proved then we may say that Sthiramati contributed more to the spread of Buddhism in Tibet than his successors Śāntarakṣita and

(1) Sastri, o.c., p. 178.

(2) Taranath, o.c., p. 146.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 147.

(4) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 171.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 271.

(6) *Ibid.*

Padmasambhava. Bose says,¹ "Sthiramati was known to the Tibetans as a great interpreter. He knew Tibetan well and translated many Sanskrit books into Tibetan. He was also famous as a grammarian and translated many books on grammar into that language."

Sthiramati, since he is spoken of by Hiuen Tsiang, must have flourished some years, perhaps a century, before the Chinese traveller. We can, however, fix the date of Sthiramati with some certainty, if he is the same Sthiramati who along with Gunamati built a monastery at Valabhi.² Very probably they are identical since Hiuen Tsiang speaks of Sthiramati as well as Gunamati.

The date of the founder of the monastery is easily established. For he is referred to by the *Valabhi Grant* of Dharsena I³ as Ācāryya Bhadanta Sthiramati, who built the Vihāra Bappapāda at Valabhi. The grant is made in *Saṁvat* 269 which, we think, is the *Gupta Saṁvat*. The reasons for assuming this *Saṁvat* are mainly two.

1. If we take the *Saka Saṁvat* then we arrive at the year 347 A.D., which is absurd if our Sthiramati is the famous Sthiramati, who was the disciple of Vasubandhu⁴ and who composed several treatises. And Vasubandhu, we know, lived in the latter half of the 5th century A.D.⁵ Consequently he could not have lived earlier than that date. Probably he flourished in the latter half of the 5th century and the first half of the 6th century A.D. Adoption of the Gupta era exactly fits in with the date arrived at. For the grant is made in *Saṁvat* 269, and if we add 319 years required for reducing *Gupta Saṁvat* to the Christian, we get 588 A.D. Now the grant says, "To the Vihāra built by Sthiramati". So, it follows that the monastery was constructed some years earlier

(1) *Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities*, p. 133.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 268.

(3) *Ind. Ant.*, VI, p. 12, plate II, II. 3 and 4.

(4) Wassilief, *Buddhismus*, p. 84 referred to by Buhler, *Ibid.*, p. 10.

(5) Takakusu, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 35.

say, a hundred years. Thus, we come to the year 488 A.D., precisely the time when Vasubandhu flourished.

The second reason why we assume the *Gupta Samvat* is that Dharasena calls himself the "great feudal chief."¹ He was probably the vassal of the Guptas and therefore adopted the Gupta era. Sthiramati, then, flourished between 460 and 550 A.D.²

We may here note that if it can be proved independently of Vasubandhu that the grant refers to the Gupta era, then we get one more proof besides that in *Paramartha's Life of Vasubandhu*, that Vasubandhu lived in the latter half of the 5th century A.D.

From a glance at the headings of the works written, translated and corrected by Sthiramati, it appears that he was the first writer, after Āsaṅga, the author of the *Yogācāra* doctrine, to write on the *Tantra*, though, according to Bose, he only undertook the revision and correction of the Tibetan works.

The works are: 1. *Śudāṅga Yoga*. 2. *Lakṣaṇābhidhāno-dhṛta laghu tantra piṇḍārtha vivarṇa nāma*. 3. *Śri Buddha kapāla mahā tantra rāja tīkā abhaya padhatināma*.

If, however, the works were not really composed by him but only revised by him then, the introduction of the *Tantra* must be attributed to Āsaṅga himself, who was primarily responsible for the introduction of *Yoga* in the theistic Buddhism.

We tread on surer and firmer ground when we come to the time when Dharmapāla was the abbot of the University. Dharmapāla, though born in Kāñcīpura, far away in the South, and though a son of a high official of the city, embraced

(1) *Ind. Ant.*, VI, p. 12, plate II, line 1.

(2) It has been definitely ascertained now that there were two Sthiramatis, the one of whom Watters speaks and the other ours, the disciple of Vasubandhu. See Kimura, o.c., p. 183. Watters, however, says that Sthiramati was the author of an "*Introduction to Mahāyānism*," which was translated into Chinese about A.D. 400. That means Sthiramati flourished much earlier, in about 300 A.D. But this seems impossible because Nālandā was not so famous then. While Sthiramati is known to succeed Vasubandhu who definitely lived in 480 A.D. Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 169.

the life of a Buddhist *Bhikṣu*, at a very early age¹ and became one of the greatest luminaries of Nālandā. His help to Buddhism is of inestimable value. For, even when he was in his teens, he accepted the challenge of a heretical pandit thrown to an assembly of Buddhist pandits who were dumb-founded and tore his arguments to pieces. By doing so, he converted to Buddhism not only the pandit but even the king who was partial to the heretic.² Thus “he acquired renown for penetration and wisdom and the reputation of his noble character was far spread.” On another occasion he held discussions, for seven long days, with 100 Hinayāna *śāstra* masters and utterly defeated them.³

He slowly made his way to Nālandā—the foremost place of learning in Central India—and when Śilabhadra came to Nālandā⁴, we find him occupying the highest office he could then wish for, namely, the headship of the University.⁵ He was a contemporary of the great Bhartṛihari and wrote the *śloka* portion of the *Bedavrittī* in collaboration with him.⁶ He wrote treatises on Etymology, Logic and the Metaphysics of Buddhism,⁷ and the following four books in Sanskrit⁸:

1. *Ālambana-pratyāya-dhyāna śāstra-vyākhyā.*
2. *Vidyāmātra-siddhi-śāstra-vyākhyā.*
3. *Śata-śāstra-vaiḍūlya-vyākhyā.*
4. *Valitattava samgraha.*

The time when Dharmapāla was the head of the University may be fixed at the early years of the seventh century, because when Hiuen Tsiang visited Nālandā in A.D. 635, Śilabhadra was the head of the University, which implies that

(1) Watters, o.c., II, p. 226.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., I, pp. 238-39.

(3) *Ibid.*, pp. 238-40.

(4) Watters, o.c., I, p. 374.

(5) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 110-11.

(6) I-Tsing, o.c., Intro., p. lvii.

(7) Bunyiu Nanjo, Appendix I, No. 16.

(8) Bose, o.c., pp. 115-116.

Dharmapāla was then dead or had retired by that time. And Dharmapāla could not have come to Nālandā earlier than the 7th century. For assuming that he left his native place Kāñcīpura at the age of 20, as he was then of marriageable age,¹ we must assign some twenty to thirty years more, to the interval, during which he became the 'Pandita' of Nālandā, when he acquired training for the Bhikkhuship, mastered the Buddhist and other heretical *śāstras*, so much so that he could win over the pandits and kings of other faiths and then go to Nālandā as a distinguished Buddhist.

Moreover, we cannot say that the Nālandā-throne was lying vacant when Dharmapāla arrived at Nālandā and it must have taken some years before he could aspire to and acquire it. In fact Taranath tells us that Dharmapāla became the 'Pandita' in Nālandā after the excellent Candrakīrti.² His tenure of office, according to Taranath, was very short. For he says, "After Dharmapāla had been Pandita in Nālandā a short while, Jayadeva became Pandita after him."³ It must be noted however that Taranath's version goes against the generally accepted view, viz., that Śilabhadra succeeded Dharmapāla.⁴

His existing works do not make full justice to the part that Dharmapāla played to keep the University going, efforts that he made in order to spread the fair name of Nālandā far and wide, and the hardships and the fire he underwent in order to hold aloft the banner of Mahāyāna Buddhism against the repeated attacks of the Hīnayānists, Sāṃkhyas and Vaiśeśikas and other followers of less important philosophies.

Śilabhadra, who succeeded Dharmapāla to the post of the Pandita of the University, was not less famous a figure among the Nālandā pandits. The accounts that we have of him are vivid and most reliable because they are recorded by Hiuen

(1) Watters, o.c., II, p. 228.

(2) Taranath, o.c., p. 161.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 162.

(4) *See* I-Tsing, o.c., Intro., p. lvii.

Tsiang from his own personal knowledge and not from any hearsay.

Son of a king in East India, as Watters explains Samatata,¹ and a Brāhmaṇ by caste, this Śīlabhadra renounced both the regal honour and comfort, as well as his caste. For, in his heart burned the fire which made him averse to all things but the quest of truth and pursuit of newer realms of knowledge. With such ideas, he embarked upon the tour of India. Fortunately, he had not to go very far, as Nālandā was comparatively much nearer from Samatata. Here, at Nālandā, he was initiated into the principles of Buddhism by Dharmapāla. At the very inception, he held out a promise of being a worthy disciple of his teacher. For the questions that he put to Dharmapāla touched the very core of all philosophies, namely, the aim and the end of all worldly things.²

Śīlabhadra surprised even the most sanguine of his supporters, when, at the young age of 30, he defeated, refuting by profound and subtle arguments, a heretic of South India, who had dared to raise his head against the renowned Dharmapāla himself. As a reward for this most wonderful victory, the king (perhaps of Magadha) granted him the revenues of a village, in spite of the persistent refusal of Śīlabhadra, who said, "A master who wears the garments of religion knows how to be contented with little and to keep himself pure. What would he do with a town?" But he had to bow to the will of the king, when the latter replied that the only way to encourage the scholars to press forward in the attainment of religion was the distinction thus shown between the learned and the ignorant in the shape of reward of revenues to the learned. But Śīlabhadra, a true *Bhikṣu* to his bone, instead of keeping the revenues for his own personal use, built a vast and magnificent monastery. This monastery of Śīlabhadra, it appears, lay on the route from Patna to Gaya, for

(1) Watters, o.c., II, p. 109.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 110. n.

the pilgrim proceeded to Gayā (Brahmagayā) from this monastery.

From a mere disciple of Dharmapāla, he rose, after Dharmapāla, to the most envied position in the then academical life, the 'Pandita,' the head of the Nālandā University.

In this capacity, he received Hiuen Tsiang, when the latter arrived at Nālandā, after visiting many other places. He appointed Jayasena to teach *Yogaśāstra* to the Chinese visitor when the latter requested Śilabhadra to instruct him in the work. Later on he "deputed the Master of the Law to expound to the congregation the *Mahāyānasāmīparigrahaśāstra* and comment on the difficulties of the *Vidyāmātrasiddhiśāstra*."¹ To him, as the head of the University, Harṣa wrote "to send four men of eminent ability well acquainted with one and the other school and also with esoteric and exoteric doctrine to the country of Orissa."² It was, again, under his presidentship, that Hiuen Tsiang won over and converted to his faith a heretic of the Lokāyata philosophy tearing to pieces shred by shred the doctrines of the different heretical schools, namely, the Bhūtas, Nirgranthas, the Kāpālikas and Jutikas, the Sāṃkhyas and the Vaiśeṣikas.³ But, for him, Hiuen Tsiang would not have gone to the King of Kāmarupa, for the pilgrim was hesitating, being afraid to undertake a long and perilous journey. He did so only when Śilabhadra explained to him that by visiting Kāmarupa he would be doing the most meritorious act, namely, the conversion of Kumāra-rājā and his family to Buddhism.⁴

Unfortunately only one work is assigned to him in the *Catalogue du fond Tibétain*:⁵ *Ārya Buddha-bhūmi vyākhyāna*. Though from what are told by the biographer of Hiuen

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 157.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 160.

(3) *Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.

(4) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 197.

(5) III, p. 365.

Tsiang, we can reasonably say that the man, who could explain the whole collection of works amounting to some thousands of books, must have written many more books than the one to which we find a reference in the *Catalogue*.

Śilabhadra's profound knowledge, his virtue and advanced age had earned for him the title of the "pater familias" of the Buddhist community.¹

As to his date, it is very easily settled. He was the abbot of Nālandā when Hiuen Tsiang visited the place. Moreover his hair had turned grey, so it appears that he must be pretty old at the time of the traveller's visit, say, about sixty years. He, therefore, flourished in the latter part of the sixth and the first half of the seventh century A.D.

Dharmakīrti may be said to have done a great service to Nālandā and incidentally to Buddhism, if he defeated the great Mīmāṃsaka—Kumārila and the still greater Vedāntist—Śaṅkara—as would appear from the account of Taranath.² According to this account, Dharmakīrti refuted each and every one of Kumārila's uncommon assertions by a hundred arguments. Not content with this success, Dharmakīrti, like a king performing the *Āśvamedha* sacrifice, announced by means of a bell, that those persons willing to join the dispute with him should come forward. Śaṅkarācārya took up the challenge and sent a messenger to Śri Nālandā to say that he was willing to join the dispute. But, as at this time, Dharmakīrti was not at Nālandā, having gone somewhere in the South, the controversy was postponed till the next year. Then, at Benares, in the presence of King Prasanna, Dharmakīrti and Śaṅkara started the debate. Before the actual debate opened, Śaṅkara laid down the conditions, which the defeated party must fulfil. He said that if Dharmakīrti and his party lost in the debate, they should either jump in the Ganges or join the *Tirthyas* (*i.e.* join Hinduism) but if Śaṅkara and his party lost, they would jump into the Ganges and die. Śaṅkara

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 112.

(2) Taranath, o.c., p. 180.

was defeated several times. At last, he prepared himself to die, but, before taking this last step, he forbade his pupil Bhāttācārya to continue the debate and triumph over the cropped-head monks. He finished his instructions to the pupil with the prophetic words, "If you cannot triumph, I shall be born as your son, I shall crush them."

But this account of Taranath raises very important issues. First, if the Dharmakīrti, he speaks of, is the same Dharmakīrti referred to by I-Tsing,¹ then we shall have to shift the hitherto known dates of Kumārila and Śaṅkara, provided the latter also are identical with the great Mīmāṃsaka and the first Advaitist, Kumārila and Śaṅkara respectively. Supposing that the two Dharmakīrtis are identical, then the probable period during which he flourished may be put down as the first half of the seventh century A.D. I-Tsing, who toured India in 671-695 A.D., says that Dharmakīrti was one of the famous men "of late years",² and classes him with Dharmapāla, and Śilabhadra, whom we know for certain to have flourished in the first half of the seventh century. We can, however, still narrow the limits of the period in which Dharmakīrti worked. This period appears to be from 639 to 671 A. D. because Hiuen Tsiang, who was in India from 635 to 639 A. D. and visited the most important centres of learning, does not seem to have ever heard of Dharmakīrti. While I-Tsing, who came some 30 years after, speaks of him as if he had not seen him. For, were he really living while he (I-Tsing) was in India, he would not have said, "He made a further improvement in Logic," but "he has made". This implies that I-Tsing had not seen Dharmakīrti, who must have died just a few years before I-Tsing landed on the Indian shore, at Tāmralipti.

We have now to bring Śaṅkara and Kumārila to live with Dharmakīrti in the middle of the seventh century A. D. (640 to 675).

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 182.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 181.

Let us see if it is possible to do so. •

We would have given up the attempt to make Śaṅkara a contemporary of Dharmakīrti, as we know even the actual date of his birth,¹ but for Dr. Pathak's remark that Śaṅkarācārya precedes Śāntarakṣita,² who, we know, lived in the first half of the eighth century A.D. He thus raises the possibility of Śaṅkara being a contemporary of Dharmakīrti, both having probably lived in the latter half of the 7th century A.D. Pathak seems to base his statement on the fact that Śāntarakṣita refers to the *Vivarta-vāda* in the following verse³:

*Athāvibhāgāmēvēdām brahmatattvam sadā sthitam,
Avidyopaplavālloko vicitram tvabhimanyatē.*

Now Brahma always remains indivisible. But due to an eclipse in the form of nescience people regard it as manifold. From this Pathak thinks that the doctrine here referred to is that of Śaṅkara.

But, why should we say that Śaṅkara's *Māyāvāda* is referred to in the verse? Can it not refer to the same doctrine first propounded by Gaudapāda or his disciples? If Śaṅkara's doctrine was here alluded to then Kamalaśīla, who gives us the names of the authors of the doctrines referred to by his guru, would surely have given us the name of Śaṅkara, who must have been his guru's contemporary or immediate predecessor.

If we accept Pathak's remark, then Śaṅkara will have to be made a contemporary of Kumārila, and possibly of Dharmakīrti also. But the fact that Śaṅkara's date is fixed at 787 A. D.⁴ and that Kamalaśīla is silent about the author of the

(1) The following two verses give the birth-date and the year in which Śaṅkara was born:

*nidhināgebhavahanyabde vibhavē māsi mādhavē
śūklē tīthau dasāmyām tu Śaṅkarācāryodayah smṛtaḥ*

and

*prāsūta tiṣya śaradāmabhīyātavat�
mēkādaśādhikaśatona catussahasram.*

This means that Śaṅkara was born on the 10th day of the bright half of *Vaiśākha* of 3889 of Kaliyuga, i.e., Śaka 709 or A. D. 787.

(2) *Dharmakīrti's Trilakṣaṇahetu*, A. B. O. R. I., XII, Pt. I, p. 79.

(3) *Tattvasaṅgraha*, G. O. S., verse 144.

(4) Keith also agrees with this date, o. c., p. 474.

doctrine referred to by his guru and commented upon by him are enough to justify us in holding the view that Śaṅkarācārya did not precede Śāntarakṣita.

What about Kumārila? He certainly lived prior to Śāntarakṣita, for the latter often refers to his views; in fact, Bhattacharyya says that *Tattvasaṅgraha* seems to have been composed specially to refute the doctrine of Kumārila.¹

Now from some leading facts of the life of Śāntarakṣita, *viz.*, that he built a monastery in Tibet in 749 and died there in 762 A. D., we can at least say this much that Śāntarakṣita must have written his book some years before he proceeded to Tibet, i. e., say about 730 A. D. Thus, if the work was written after Kumārila died, then we can say that Kumārila must have lived in c. 700 A. D., a date which has been generally accepted²; if it was written when Kumārila still lived and preached as a contemporary of Śāntarakṣita then Kumārila must be placed in the first half of 700 A. D. If we take the first alternative, even then Kumārila cannot be placed earlier than 700 A. D.; consequently the account of Taranath which makes him contemporaneous with Dharmakīrti will have to be dismissed as inspired by religious bigotry and false pride.

We have, therefore, to deprive Dharmakīrti of the great honour done to him. But it is much better that his fame should rest on the deeds he performed rather than on false reports. Of these we have previously spoken and so we now pass on to other great luminaries of Nālandā.

The life of the author of *Śikṣā-Samuccya*, contents of which we have summarised elsewhere, makes a most interesting reading. Śāntideva's life is preserved to us in a MS., now in the possession of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,³ and *Baudha Gāna-o-Dohā*. The MS. gives the name of its writer as Kas-thamandapiya Śri Kirāta pandita, though the name of the work is missing.

(1) *Tattvasaṅgraha*, Foreword, o. c., p. LXXXIII.

(2) See Keith, o. c., p. 474.

(3) Shastri, *Catalogue, Bengal*, No. 9990, I, pp. 51-53.

Śāntideva, according to this writer, was the son of King Mañjuvarman. His mother, seeing him disgusted with worldly life, told him that a king, a painter and a poet do not go to heaven. She, therefore, advised him to go to Buddha Bodhisattva-deśa Śri Mañjuvajrādhishthāna (that is, the country of Buddha and Bodhisattvas, the abode of Śri Mañjuvajra). On the way he came across a girl who took him to her guru Siddha Śri Mañjuvajrasamādhi. This Siddha Puruṣa told him that he should go to Madhyadeśa (Central India) to the king of Magadha, after having realized Mañjuvajra and after having obtained knowledge of Mañjuśri from him in 12 years.

The MS. further tells us that he entered the Nālandā Mahāvihāra under a disguise. His sobriety and solemnity earned for him the name of Śāntideva. Perhaps this name was given to him in jest by other students, as it appears from the later account. At Nālandā, he studied the three *Pitakas*.

Once some students were anxious to know if this Śāntideva knew anything new. And an opportunity was offered to them to test his knowledge by a custom that was prevalent at Nālandā. Every year, in the bright half of the month of *Jyeṣṭha* (May-June), a discourse was given by pandits in imitation of the discourse of *Ruddhi Pratihāryas* which refuted the *śūstras* of Purṇa and others. So, on this day, they asked Śāntideva to give them a lecture on any new subject he could choose. Śāntideva humbly replied that he knew nothing. But the students persisted (because they were out for fun), as they knew very well that he was a blockhead and would make a fool of himself in the assembly, if he would speak anything. Then he was led out in the huge open space or hall of the Dharmasālā, lying outside to the north-west of the *Vihāra*, where eminent pandits had assembled. Surrounded by this distinguished gathering, Śāntideva just thought to himself, "I have composed three works—*Sūtrasamuccaya*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra*." Thus thinking he went to the professorial chair (*simhāsana*) and asked the audience, "Shall I lecture to you on what the *Rsis* like Jina (Buddha) have said (*Ārṣa*) or what others have said (*Anārṣa*)?"

He then read out to them the *Caryāvatāra* (i. e. *Bodhicaryāvatāra*). A miracle then happened, when he was reciting the following verse from the work:

“*Yadā na bhāvo nābhāvo mateḥ santiṣṭhate pūraḥ*

Tadānyagatyabhāvena nirālambah pṛasajyate

“When a man gets rid of such ideas as existence or non-existence, then he attains perfect peace as there is no other condition of which he can think of.”

As Śāntideva was finishing this verse Lord Mañjuśri appeared before him and took him away with Him into the *antarikṣa* and there they both gradually disappeared. The students were stunned by this supernatural sight and talked about his departure, and then went to the room of Śāntideva. Here they found his three works and offered them to the world.

We may disbelieve the supernatural event. But this much stands out clearly from the story that Śāntideva's genius was not recognised for a long time. The students took him to be a second “Jadabharata”. It was, however, when they persisted in their attempt to fool Śāntideva, that the latter shone forth in all his brilliance, and showed them his metal, and in appreciation of his genius the Lord Himself came down to escort him to heaven.

Śāntideva flourished according to Bendall¹ in the later half of the eighth century. But this date has been shifted some years back, *viz.*, between 695-743 A.D., because Śāntarakṣita in his *Tattvasiddhi* quotes a full verse from the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* of Śāntideva. Since the former lived in the major part of the 8th century A.D., and since the latter is not spoken of by I-Tsing, Bhattacharyya has assigned the date 695-743 to Śāntideva.²

Śāntarakṣita—the man—can hardly be separated from Śāntarakṣita—the Philosopher, Logician and the Tāntric. Of his private life we know very little. Some say that he was a native of Gaur.³ Vidyābhiusana, on the strength of

(1) *Sikṣāsamuccaya*, Intro., p. V. referred to by Bhattacharyya, o. c., p. XXIII.

(2) *Tattvasaṅgraha*, o.c., Foreword, p. XXIII.

(3) Das, *Journey to Lhassa and Tibet*, p. 295.

another Tibetan source, says that he was born in the royal family of Zahor, which cannot be Lahore as Waddell has said,¹ but which very likely must be, as Bhattacharyya has pointed out, the small village of Sābhār in Pargana of Vikramapura.²

The most important phase of his life is his visit to Tibet. He had the distinction of being the first pandit who was officially invited to Tibet by King Khri-son-den-tsan. His presence in Tibet, as we are told by Das,³ was not well received by the gods and demigods. These caused a great damage by making the rivers flow, etc. So Śāntarakṣita was sent to Nepal. After a time, the king again sent messengers to call him back. This time Śāntarakṣita advised the king to send for Padmasaṁbhava—a pandit of Nālandā—and a great Tāntric scholar; the latter by his magic powers could control and quiet the gods and spirits. Padmasaṁbava arrived and did what was expected of him. Then, in A.D. 749, Śāntarakṣita and Padmasaṁbhava erected a monastery after the model of the monastery of Odantapuri. Śāntarakṣita had the honour of being the first abbot of this new monastery called “Samye”. For thirteen years he worked in the cause of the propagation of Buddhism in Tibet and finally laid his life at its altar in the year 762 A.D.

Arguing back from the date of his death, *viz.*, A.D. 762 and taking into account the various leading factors of his life, namely, that he visited Tibet for the first time in 743 A.D. as has been shown by Bhattacharyya⁴ and assuming that Śāntarakṣita was about 40 years old, because he had by this time written *Tattvasaṅgraha*, *Tattvasiddhi*, etc., and become so famous that he was called for by the King of Tibet, we come to A.D. 703, a date almost identical with that given by Bose, *viz.*, 705 A.D.⁵ in the reign of King Gopāla, though this king, according to Banerji, came to the throne in 750 A.D.⁶

(1) *Lamaism*, p. 379 *et seq.*

(2) *o.c.*, p. XIII.

(3) *Indian Pandits in Tibet*, J. B. T. S., I, Part I (1893), pp. 1-31.

(4) *o.c.*, p. XIV.

(5) *Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities*, p. 124.

(6) *The Pālas of Bengal*, p. 47.

Padmasambhava, who followed Śāntarakṣita into Tibet, was the son of the King of Udayana, Indrabodhi. Leaving aside the folk-lores about his birth and early life, which cannot be well relied upon, what we know positively of him is that he resided at the Nālandā University, when the Tibetan king sent an invitation to him, and that he was a prominent expounder of the *Yogācāra* school.

In Tibet, he founded Lamaism, and is now deified and celebrated in Lamaism as Buddha himself. How he established this new religion is graphically described by Waddell from whose account we have drawn the information about Śāntarakṣita and Padmasambhava. He says,¹ “He vanquished all the chief devils of the land. His most powerful weapons in warring with the demons were the *vajra*, symbolic of the thunder of Indra, and spells extracted from the Mahāyāna gospels, by which he shattered his supernatural adversaries.” We have already referred to the part he played in the establishment of a monastery in Tibet.

From the work that Padmasambhava did in Tibet, namely, the spread of Tāntrism, we can well imagine what a hold the Tāntric faith must have had upon the intelligentsia of Nālandā in particular and of India in general or else how could a pandit of Nālandā, who was specially sent for, deliver no other message to the inhabitants of “the roof of the world” but belief in magic and sorcery and worship of innumerable gods and goddesses and demons ?²

This Lamaism or Tāntric Buddhism with some elements from Bon religion was firmly established in Tibet by Kamalaśīla. He was a professor of *Tantra* at Nālandā³, besides a great philosopher and logician. The circumstances under which he was called by the Tibetan king are very interesting.

One Hoshang, a pandit from China, gave a very peculiar interpretation of *Prajñāpāramitā* and other Buddhist *śāstras*.

(1) Waddell, o.c., pp. 24-28.

(2) See *Ibid.*

(3) Vidyabhushana, o.c., pp. 129-130.

As this was contrary to what Śāntarakṣita had taught, the people were in a fix. They did not know whom to follow. The king then arranged a debate between Śāntarakṣita and Hoshang, with a view to see as to who would win in the debate. As fortune would have it, Śāntarakṣita found that he was losing and he therefore requested the king to send for Kamalaśīla because he had great faith in his learning and powers of debate, and was sure that he would bring victory to him.

Kamalaśīla came and easily defeated the Hoshang. The following lines¹ illustrate what a great debator he was, and how gradually he assails the opponent's views and brings him round to his own.

“First of all the Hoshang said—When virtuous or sinful acts are performed the result is either translation to heaven or damnation in hell. So in none of these conditions could the *Sattva* be liberated from worldly existence. Both were therefore obstructions to his attaining to Buddhahood, *i.e.*, *Nirvāṇa*. For instance, he continued, the sky becomes equally obscured by a white or dark cloud. Wherefore one should not think on any subject at all. If the mind remains absolutely free from thought, *i.e.*, inactive, then emancipation from *Bhāva* (worldly existence) is possible and not otherwise. Want of *Vikalpanā* (absence of thoughtfulness, *i.e.* intellectual activity in body or in speech) is equivalent to the state of *Nirālamba*, *i.e.* the total isolation or abstraction of the mind.

“Kamalaśīla replied—To say (that it is possible) to be free from thought, (in other words) to be in a state of absolute mental inactivity, constitutes actual rejection of *Pratyāveksanā Prajñā*, knowledge derived from critical examination (of things and phenomena). The root (basis) of *Samyak Jñāna* (perfect wisdom) is indeed *Pratyāveksanā Prajñā*. Therefore the abandonment of it is tantamount to rejecting the *Lokāvīgata*

(1) From Das, *Indian Pandits in Tibet*, J. B. T. S., I, Part I, 1893, pp. 1-31.

Prajñā i.e. wisdom that transcends the faculties of man and god. Without the *Pratyāvekṣanā Prajñā* how can the *Yogi* (the meditative devotee) find himself in the state of *Avikalpanā*, i.e., the state of absolute abstraction? If there be absolute inactivity of mind so as to cause unconsciousness, i.e., the loss of the power of cognition of all external or internal phenomena and in that to be devoid of knowledge, the mind would be contending against inactivity itself. If I think that I must not remember any *Dharma* that very thought belies the determination and brings all remembrance with greater force. If again the mind be thrown into a state of unconsciousness i.e., its functions be paralysed, it may be freed from *Vikalpanā* temporarily, i.e., for a time it may remain in that state. Without *Samyak Pratyāvekṣanā* there are no means of attaining to the state in which the mind is free from *Vikalpanā*. If, only the working of the faculty of the memory is suspended, in the absence of *Samyak Pratyāvekṣanā*, you cannot realise that all things and phenomena (*Sarvadharma*) are in their nature void and their apparent state impermanent, and unless that is acquired, the obfuscating process that is constantly at work will not be removed. Therefore by *Samyak Prajñā* the false (delusive) notions should be thrown out, and while remembering everything, there cannot be forgetting all things (*Sarvadharma*) which is evidently a contradiction. The working of the memory and at the same time absolute inactivity of the mind cannot exist together. Because the former is activity, and the latter state its negation which is to be acquired (according to the Hoshang) cannot be co-existent. How can the *Pūrvasthāna Anusmarana*, i.e., the remembrance of one's place and condition of former existence be obliterated? Therefore the *Yogi* who thinks by discrimination acquires *Samyak Prajñā* and meditating on the inner and outer phenomena (*Sarvadharma*) in reference to the three times, loses the *Vikalpanā* (diversity of thought) and thereby becomes free from erroneous notions and conceptions. In this manner being well versed in the *Upāya* (means) and *Jñāna* (knowledge) one should be free from darkness and thereby acquire the state of *Sambodhi*.

Dharma—Supreme Enlightenment.”¹

Being a disciple and a contemporary of Śāntarakṣita, Kamalaśīla must have lived in A.D. 720-780, because he must be at least 25 years of age when he wrote the commentary (*Pañjikā*) on *Tattvasaṅgraha*, which seems to have inspired confidence in Śāntarakṣita, who said to the Tibetans that Kamalaśīla would bring victory to the side of real *Dharma*, when there would arise a division in the Buddhist camp in Tibet². *Tattvasaṅgraha* was perhaps written in A. D. 740, before Śāntarakṣita went to Tibet. And as Kamalaśīla was sent for, just before Śāntarakṣita died, in 762 A. D, we may allow some 20 years more to Kamalaśīla, that is, 780 A. D.

Candrogomin was another of the great pandits of Nālandā, whose contribution to the development of Tāntrism appears to be great. Only the number of books that he wrote is sufficient to stagger us. No less than 60 books, all written in Sanskrit, are attributed to him. To mention a few of them: 1. *Siñhanāda Sādhana*, 2. *Mahākāruṇika stotra*, 3. *Rakṣūcakra*, 4. *Abhicāra Karman*.

The very names of the works are enough to show their character. They are evidently Tāntric, which shows that more and more interest was taken in the development of this cult, even perhaps to the detriment of other studies. Our Candrogomin, however, appears to be a versatile writer. For, besides writing extensively on *Tantra*, he distinguished himself in literature, Grammar, Logic, Astronomy, Music, fine arts and the science of medicine.³ In Logic, particularly, next to *Tantra* he was so well-versed that he was the first from the Bengal school of logicians to attract the attention of the literary world.⁴

This Candrogomin is not the same Candra, the author of the Candra grammar, on which Dharmapāla wrote a commentary. For even if Tibetan works were to tell us that he was a

(1) Das, *J. B. T. S.*, I, Part I, 1893, pp. 1—31.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) Vidyabhusana, o.c., pp. 121-122.

(4) *Ibid.*, Introduction, p. XX.

contemporary of Śīla, son of Śri Harṣa, who reigned in 700 A. D., the very nature of his works which are purely Tāntric, shows him to be a writer, who must have flourished in the eighth century. For it is about this time, that Tāntrism was becoming the all-important subject of the day.

We have the most trustworthy account of Vīradeva who was appointed governor of Nālandā by King Devapāla.¹ This Vīradeva was a resident of Nagarhāra (in the vicinity of modern Jalalabad²). He probably came to Nālandā, thinking it to be the only place in India which would recognise his merits and honour him accordingly. For, as the inscription says, "He had studied all the *Vēdas* and reflected on the *śāstras*."³ 'This quintessence of intelligence', as the inscription calls him, was highly revered by the king. And the king, perhaps, translated his appreciation of the man into action by getting him appointed by the decree of the monks as a permanent governor of Nālandā.⁴

From line 12, which speaks of the greatness of Vīradeva, we incidentally learn that Nālandā was a very renowned *vihāra*. It runs thus: "And who, on becoming the lord of the lady Great Fame, graced though he be already was here by Nālandā, governed (by and) true (to him and) decorated by a ring of famous *vihāras*, was well praised by good people as a good man." The words "decorated by a ring of famous *vihāras*" perhaps refer to the Nālandā seal, having a Dharmacakra and two gazelles, which was very likely used for the purpose of honouring those persons, who were appointed governors or pandits of Nālandā.⁵

Another inference, though of little importance, that can be deduced from the above phrase is that there were very many *vihāras*, that is to say, colleges at Nālandā.

(1) *Ghosrawa Inscription, Ind. Ant.*, XVII, p. 311.

(2) Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, I, p. 43.

(3) o.c., Line 7, p. 311.

(4) *Ibid.*, ll. 10-11.

(5) See *Frontispiece*.

This Vīradeva erected two *chaityas* on the hill Indraśaila (or Giryek, about 5 miles south-west of Ghosrāwā).¹

Of greater importance than the account of Vīradeva, however, is the fact, conclusively proved by this inscription, that Buddhism and more particularly Nālandā University were in a flourishing condition in the 9th or according to some scholars 10th century A. D. to which period Devapāla's rule is assigned.²

We take note of Buddhakīrti not because he was a very distinguished scholar of Nālandā but because, in him, we find the last connecting link between the Universities of Nālandā and Vīkramaśilā and because he was perhaps the last great scholar that the University produced before it was destroyed by the Moslems. The connecting link is found in the fact that our pandit was a contemporary of Abhyākara Gupta of the Vīkramaśilā University. The latter flourished towards the end of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth century A. D.³ Soon after, in this period,—may be these pandits were witnesses,—the famous Universities were razed to the ground, monks slain, and the vast and gigantic libraries burnt by the Moslems.

Pandits of Nālandā were famous all over India for their knowledge. Countless pandits of different faiths had to go away out of shame and disgust or renounce their faith and become converts to Buddhism on being defeated in discussion. We have mentioned previously the specific instances, namely, of Dharmapāla, Sthiramati, Śilabhadra, and Hiuen Tsiang. The last may well be included among the pandits of Nālandā, for it was Nālandā that made him what he afterwards became, a pandit conversant with the doctrines of the *Bhūtas*, *Nirgranthas*, the *Kāpālikas*, *Jutikas*, the *Sāṃkhyas* and the *Vaiśeṣikas*, over

(1) *Ind. Ant.*, XVII, Line 11, p. 311.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 309.

(3) See Bose, o.c., p. 137. Mr. Bose does not quote the source. It appears that he has mainly culled his information from Taranath, *History of Buddhism*, or Das, *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*.

and above acquiring a thorough knowledge of the cardinal principles of Buddhism so as to maintain them against all the above mentioned faiths.

Harṣa's tribute to the pandits of Nālandā is worth mentioning. In a letter to Śilabhadra, the head of the Nālandā convent, he wrote,¹ "Now I know that in your convent there are eminent priests and exceedingly gifted, of different schools of learning, who will undoubtedly be able to overthrow them (priests of the Little Vehicle). So now, in answer to their challenge, I beg you to send four men of ability, well acquainted with one and the other school, and also with the esoteric and exoteric doctrine, to the country of Orissa."

Even apart from the fact that the tribute comes from so great a king as Śri Harṣa, himself a very distinguished poet and dramatist, the words are very important, because they speak of the versatility of the pandits of Nālandā. The pandits could discuss and discourse on not only all the Mahāyāna doctrines which the Nālandā University championed, but on all other systems, Hīnayāna and others, which we have mentioned in the case of Hiuen Tsiang.

Nālandā was represented by no less than 1000 pandits in the grand assembly convened by Śri Harṣa at Kānyakubja to investigate the treatise of the Master of the Law of China (Hiuen Tsiang).² This fact alone is enough to speak of the importance of the University and the pandits who had the honour to represent it.

We shall close this topic about the pandits of Nālandā with a peep into their customs and manners.

The head of all the pandits, the teaching staff and others, was called a Superior. Under him was the Karmadāna, or Vihāraswāmi or Vihārapāla. He was the chief officer after the Superior and to him the utmost deference was paid.³

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 160.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 176-177.

(3) I-Tsing, *Nan-hae-k'i-kwei-nin-fā-ch'u'en*, referred to by Beal, *J. R. A. S.*, XIII (N. S.), p. 571.

The pandits believed in the maxim “ honour where honour is due.” And in accordance with this truism a distinction was made between the learned and the unlearned. The former were given the best rooms in the monastery, besides servants were asked to wait upon them. Again, if they gave daily lectures they were freed from the business imposed upon the inmates of the monastery,¹ whereas an ordinary priest was given just the treatment he deserved. Though food and lodging were supplied to him, all the other amenities that were shown to the revered and the learned were withheld from him. “ He was regarded as a mere priest.”²

The pandits were themselves very strict in regard to their own discipline. For a teacher himself resigned for committing an act, which was quite innocent, but, in contravention of the monastic rules; perhaps this incident must have led I-Tsing to remark that “ the rites of the monastery Nālandā are still more strict.”³

A peculiar custom prevailed at Nālandā as to the manner in which venerable and learned pandits travelled. “ These,” says I-Tsing,⁴ “ ride in sedan-chairs, but never on horseback.”

The pandits of Nālandā showed the same zeal and enthusiasm for the religious and monastic practices which Buddha had prescribed, even when they seemed to be engrossed in the pursuit of knowledge.

The same observance of the Rain-retreat and the assignment of rooms according to the ranks of the priests;⁵ the same *Upasampāda* ordination, though in a different way,⁶ the priests followed even at such a distance of time, as the 7th century A. D. when I-Tsing visited Nālandā. This shows that even though the place had outgrown itself, from a mere town, oft

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 64.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 65.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 30.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 86.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 103.

visited by Buddha with his small band, to a very enviable position in the eyes of the world as an international centre of learning, it still retained the old practices which the World-honoured had taught.¹ And these it found "beneficial", for in following the World-honoured it was known and honoured in the world.

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 86.

CHAPTER VI

RITUALISM OF NĀLANDĀ BUDDHISM

Excavations at Nālandā have brought to light numerous images in bronze, and stone. They are worked out in such a variety of shapes that it is but natural to inquire what the University had to do with so many variegated images. Further, what part, if any, they played in the education of the student. It is these and other questions that are discussed in this Chapter.

Theology, we said in Chapter IV, was compulsory for the student. Its study, however, did not consist in a mere theoretical knowledge of the subject. The student was required to perform the religious rites and worship of images which he had read in books. Of course, these rites and ceremonies were mainly those taught by the later Mahāyāna Buddhism. Only such rites as *Chailayavandana* (which is described below) belonged to the early Buddhism. The worship of images was a distinct feature of the Mahāyāna.

The rites at Nālandā began with a bath in the morning. "Every morning," writes I-Tsing, "a *ghanti* is sounded to remind the priests of bathing-hour. Sometimes a hundred, sometimes a thousand (priests) leave the monastery together and proceed in all directions towards a number of great pools of water (near Nālandā) where all of them take a bath."¹ From the graphic description quoted above, it would appear that a morning bath was obligatory for all and that it could not be taken at any time one liked but at the prescribed hour only.

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., pp. 108-9.



FIGURE OF BUDDHA (BRONZE)
(FROM NALANDA)



This bath was followed by the Ablution of the Holy Image (Buddha). “The priest in charge (Karmadāna)”, says I-Tsing, “strikes a *Ghantā* (a gong) for an announcement. After stretching a jewelled canopy over the court of the monastery, and ranging perfumed water-jars in rows at the side of the temple, an image of either gold, silver, copper or stone is put in a basin of the same material, while a band of girls plays music there. The image having been anointed with scent, water with perfume is poured over it.....After having been washed, it is wiped with a clean white cloth; then it is set up in the temple where all sorts of beautiful flowers are furnished.”¹ These rites, however, were to be performed “by the resident members under the management of the priest in charge.”² Hence we may call this rite a public-rite.

The statement immediately following the above will make our remark explicit: “In individual apartments of a monastery,” continues the same author, “priests bathe an image every day so carefully that no ceremony is omitted.”³ We are not told what the next rite was after placing the image in a temple. But we presume that the priest must be chanting some *ślotras*, or *mantras*, etc.

But this was not all. Late in the afternoon or in the evening twilight another rite was gone through. This was the *Caitiyavandana*. I-Tsing has given a very vivid description of this ceremony. “All the assembled priests come out of the gate of their monastery, and walk three times round a Stūpa, offering incense and flowers. They all kneel down, and one of them who sings well begins to chant hymns describing the various virtues of the Great Teacher with a melodious, pure and sonorous voice, and continues to sing ten or twenty *ślokas*. They in succession return to the place in the monastery where they usually assemble. When all of them have sat down, a Sūtra-reciter, mounting the Lion-seat (*Sīnhāsana*), reads a

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., pp. 147-9.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 149.

(3) *Ibid.*

short Sūtra. The Lion-seat of well proportioned dimensions is placed near the head priest. Among the scriptures which are to be read on such an occasion the 'Service in three parts' is often used. This is a selection by the venerable Aśvaghosha. The first part containing ten *ślokas* consists of a hymn in praise of the three 'Honourable Ones' (*Triratna*). The second part is a selection from some scriptures consisting of the Buddha's words. After the hymn, and after reading the words of the Buddha, there is an additional hymn, as the third part of the service, of more than ten *ślokas*, being prayers that express the wish to bring one's good merit to maturity.

These three sections follow one another consecutively, from which its name—the Three-part service—is derived. When this is ended, all the assembled priests exclaim 'Subhāshita' !

After the Sūtra-reciter has descended, the head priest rising bows to the Lion-seat. That done, he salutes the seats of the saints, and then he returns to his own. Now the priest second in rank rising salutes them in the same manner as the first, and afterwards bows to the head priest.

When he has returned to his own seat, the priest third in rank performs the same ceremonies, and in the same manner do all the priests successively."¹

The above was the usual mode of *Caityavandana*. But at Nālandā, the same worship was performed in a slightly different manner because it was difficult to assemble a large number of priests in one place. At Nālandā, therefore, the worship was performed in the following manner. "Every day," says I-Tsing, "it is customary to send out one precentor to go round from place to place chanting hymns, being preceded by monastic lay servants and children carrying with them incense and flowers. He goes from one hall to another, and in each he chants the service, every time three or five *ślokas* in a high tone and the sound is heard all around. At twilight he would finish his duty."²

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. 152-4.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 154-5.



FIGURE OF BUDDHA DEPICTING SCENES FROM HIS LIFE
(FROM JAGDISPURA—NEAR NALANDA)



We have given above two modes of *Caityavandana*, one prevalent at Tāmralipti, the other at Nālandā. And the reason for this procedure is that though I-Tsing says that the first method was prevalent at Tāmralipti, still it appears, after going through the whole narrative, that sometimes even the first method of *Caityavandana* was followed at Nālandā, when it would be convenient to do so.

I-Tsing concludes his description of the rituals with the words, "In addition (to the above referred to *Caityavandanas*?) there are some who, sitting alone, facing the shrine (Gandhakutī), praise the Buddha in their heart. There are others who, going to the temple, (in a small party) kneel side by side with their bodies upright, and, putting their hands on the ground, touch it with their heads and thus perform the Threefold Salutation."¹

It is a little surprising that neither Hiuen Tsiang nor I-Tsing speak of any of the Tāntric images and their worship. I-Tsing only refers to the images of Buddha and Hāritī,² and Hiuen Tsiang, though he does mention Tārā,³ Avalokiteśvara, Hāritī,⁴ Buddha, Bodhisattva, never speaks of any other image, such as Mārīcī, Jambhala, Mahākāla—all Tāntric images—or of Viṣṇu, Śiva, Pārvatī, Sūrya, Ganeśa, and many others which have been discovered at Nālandā and many places in Magadha.

As a necessary complement to our account of the Nālandā ritualism, we shall describe in the following pages some of the most important images from the point of view of Buddhist iconography.

The images are carved out of black stone, white sandstone, and sometimes cast in copper and bronze.

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 155.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 37.

(3) o.c., II, pp. 103 & 174.

(4) *Ibid.*, I, p. 110.

The whole find of images may be classified into three parts, as belonging to Early Mahāyāna (pantheon), Tāntric Mahāyāna (pantheon) and Hindu pantheon.¹

Originally I intended to describe only a few of the images found at Nālandā. But just when the manuscript was being sent to the press, Kempers published his book on "*The Bronzes of Nālandā and Hindu-Javanese Art*". In it he refers to some unique images, of both the Buddhist and Hindu pantheon, discovered at Nālandā. And I think it fit to incorporate some of them here.

In this iconographical description of images we may proceed in a chronological order, that is, in the order in which they arose in the Buddhist pantheon.²

The images of Buddha, thus, come first. Of such images we take the bronze figure of Buddha.³ It is standing on a lotus without a nimbus or an aureole. The right hand is raised in the *Abhaya-mudrā*, the left holding the hem of the upper garment. The robe covers both the shoulders and ends on both sides of the body in a fold in the shape of a swallow's tail. The usual marks: *ūrṇā*, elongated ears, etc., are present. The hair is arranged in little curls, and the *uṣṇīṣa* is rather high.

Kempers, after first trying to show if it is Dipamkara comes to the conclusion that it is 'Buddha'.⁴

We may compare this bronze Buddha, admittedly of the Pāla art, with the huge stone figure of Buddha from Jagdīś-

(1) Coomaraswamy (*History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 113) has the following classification: Early Mahāyāna types, with Buddha and Bodhisattva images and votive *stūpas*; then marking the development of the Tantrayāna on the basis of the older Yogācāra doctrines, the appearance of Śaiva influences and images; and finally the introduction of the Kālacakra system with Vaiṣṇava figures.


(2) This, however, will have no reference to the actual time of the production of the images. For many of the images of Buddha, though they rank first in the pantheon, belong to a very late period, about the 8th or 9th century A.D., to the time of the Pālas.

(3) See pl. I. For another bronze Buddha, but in a different posture, see A. S. I. A. R., 1928-29, pl. LVII (a).

(4) *Nālandā Bronzes*, p. 18.



MAITREYA (FUTURE BUDDHA)
(FROM NALANDA)



pura, a mile away from Nālandā.¹

Next to draw our attention are the images of Maitreya, (Future Buddha), Mañjuśri, Avalokiteśvara and other Bodhisattvas.

We have a very fine specimen of Maitreya in a stone image.² It is a standing figure, richly decorated with ornaments. Its right hand is in *Varadamudrā*, boon-giving pose; in the left there is an oval vase, and also the hem of the upper garment. As in the Buddha described above, the robe covers both the shoulders and ends on both sides of the body in a fold in the shape of a swallow's tail. On the left of the figure, in a corner, there is a worshipper.³

Kempers gives a beautiful figure of Mañjuśri, Buddhist god of learning and wisdom, and a six-armed Avalokiteśvara, and references to a number of figures of Lokeśvara (No. 43, 57, 62, 116).⁴

From amongst other Bodhisattvas found at Nālandā we describe one that is lying in the Museum of the Indian Historical Research Institute, Bombay. It is carved out in black stone. The figure of Bodhisattva (in the centre) is seated with *Dhyānamudrā*, in *Vajrasana* on a lotus. The face is badly disfigured. All round the figure there is a beautiful scroll design, besides figures of Buddhas (?), a swan, a horse and symbols of Buddhist *Triratna*.⁵

We may compare with the above—a peculiar figure from Nālandā—Samantabhadra or Kṣitigarbha. “It is a Bodhisattva sitting with his right leg folded, the left knee being raised and fastened to the waist by means of the shawl which usually is carried round the upper part of the body. The right arm is

(1) See pl. II.

(2) See pl. III.

(3) For other figures of Maitreya from Nālandā see Kempers, o.c., p. 31.

(4) See o.c., pp. 27-30, figures 5 and 6.

(5) See pl. IV.

broken at the elbow, the left holds a stalk or branch with three ramifications ending in buds or jewels".¹

Of the gods and goddesses of the Buddhist pantheon we first describe the goddesses Hāritī and Tārā. Worship of these images was prevalent among the Buddhists from a very early date. Figures of Hāritī can be traced even to the Grecko-Gāndhāra art.² And there is no doubt that both Hāritī and Tārā were worshipped at Nālandā. As I-Tsing says, "The image of Hāritī is found either in the porch or in a corner of the dining-hall of all Indian monasteries depicting her as holding a babe in her arms, and round her knees three or five children. Every day an abundant offering of food is made before this image".³ The Nālandā figure of Hāritī illustrates well the description given by I-Tsing. "The goddess is sitting in the *Lalitāsana* on a seat, adorned with *vyālaka* motif; a worshipper is pictured to the proper right. In front of the pedestal we notice a mirror, a dish with offerings(?) and a vase. The attributes of the goddess are a lemon in the right hand, the left holding a child which is sitting on her left knee".⁴

A number of figures of the goddess Tārā has been unearthed. And it is quite certain that Tārā was also worshipped at Nālandā. Of the numerous such images, the one described below is perhaps the finest so far as art is concerned.⁵ It is cast in bronze. The figure is seated in *Vajrāsana* on a lotus, supported by two dwarfish figures. On the pedestal, to the proper right, is a worshipper. In all there are 18 arms. The two principal ones are held in *Dharmacakramudrā* against the breasts; others hold different kinds of emblems which are not clearly visible. It is fully decked with ornaments—crown,

(1) Kempers, o.c., p. 31, figure 9.

(2) Figure of one of such images we have in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.

(3) o.c., p. 37.

(4) Kempers, o.c., p. 46, figure 24.

(5) See pl. V.



BODHISATTVA FROM NALANDA
(INDIAN HISTORICAL RESEARCH MUSEUM)
St. Xavier's College, Bombay



BRONZE FIGURE OF 18 ARMED TARA (?)
(FROM NALANDA)

earrings, necklace, armlets, girdle, etc. Behind the figure, there is a circular *Prabhā*, rich in decoration, on the centre of which there are two figures—probably *Vidyādhara*s—bearing a beautiful umbrella.

The Guide merely calls the figure “18 armed Tārā”.¹ But this is not enough from iconographical point of view. The number of arms is indeed very peculiar and we fail to identify or find a corresponding *Sāthana* referred to by Battacharyya in his *Buddhist Iconography*. If there were a book in any of the hands then that symbol coupled with the *Dharmacakra-mudrā* would have warranted us to call it a special figure of Prajñāpāramitā.² Can it be a figure of Mahā Śrī Tārā?

Kempers describes other specimens of Tārā found at Nālandā.³ Of these, the figure of Śyāma Tārā is worth noting. Of Bhṛukutī Tārā or Gaurī, Kempers says that “We may safely assume that the goddess was actually worshipped at Nālandā.”⁴

Other goddesses found at Nālandā and which belong to the Early Mahāyāna pantheon are Prajñāpāramitā⁵ and Vasudhārā.⁶

From amongst the second class we first describe one of the emanations of Dhyāni Buddha, Akṣobhya, namely, Vajrapāṇi. This figure is seated on a lotus in *Lalitāsana* pose with attendant figures on either side of its hanging leg. It has two hands, the right one holds a *vajra* and seems to rest on the breast; the left rests on the lotus seat and holds a lotus stalk. Among the ornaments are armlets, necklace, and a girdle. It wears a crown, and the hair hang down in curls on two sides of the head.

There is no Dhyāni Buddha in the tiara, but two such are represented on sides in *Abhayamudrā*. On the back and

(1) *Guide to Nālandā*, pl. VI, p. 7.

(2) Bhattacharyya, *Buddhist Iconography*, p. 126.

(3) Kempers, o. c., p. 40, figures 13 and 20.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 42, figure 15.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 43, figures 17 and 18.

(6) *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45, figure 21.

above the central figure and the Dhyāni Buddhas there is a *stūpa*; on the left side of the lotus-stalk and on the pedestal there are inscriptions.

Of the later Tantrayāna pantheon, the most striking figures found at Nālandā are those of Trailokyavijaya, Heruka, Mārīcī, Jambhala, etc.

A stone image of a god who tramples over Maheśvara and Gaurī represents Trailokyavijaya, one of the independent gods of the Tantrayāna Buddhist pantheon.¹

So also the stone-image, dancing in *Ardhaparyāṇka* on a lotus, the right hand bearing a *vajra* raised up, the left holding something like a bowl, and supporting a *khatvāṅga* on his left shoulder and wearing a garland of skulls, answers to the description of the most popular of Tāntric gods, Heruka.²

Jambhala, the Buddhist god of wealth, is also found at Nālandā and we have got very interesting specimens of him in Nos. 202 and 641 (which represent a group of Jambhalas).³

Of Mārīcī though we have a good specimen in bronze figure 389, still we find a very beautiful image lying at some distance from the monastery area.⁴ It is about six feet in height with a *Prabhā* all round. It has three faces, the left face is that of a boar; eight arms: the right ones hold sword, *vajra*, arrow, fourth (broken); the left ones, bow, *ankuśa*.....

Besides the central figure there are three figures of females, two on either side of the legs and one underneath the central figure. All have the faces of a boar. These three are the three among four companions—Vartālī, Vadālī, Varālī and Varāhamukhī. Underneath the hands, on the left side, we have the figure of a flying woman.

(1) See Bhattacharyya, o. c., pp. 146-7; pl. XXIX (c).


(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

(3) See Kempers, o.c., pp. 33-34, figure 11 and *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1927-28, p. 160.

(4) See pl. VI.



MARICI
(FROM NALANDA)







VAJRASARADA
(FROM NALANDA)

She wears a big lower garment, a necklace, a girdle and a crown. The mass of rays in which she happily resides, as the *Sādhana* says, are very beautifully portrayed. This description very nearly corresponds to the one given by Bhattacharyya of *Mārīcīpicuvā*.¹

Other Tāntric images found at Nālandā which have been already taken note of are Yamāntaka, Vajrasattva, Aparājītā, Mañjuvara and Vajrapāṇi. Of this group, Vajrapāṇi belongs to the Divine Bodhisattvas. His main characteristics are that he holds a *vajra* and in his tiara carries the image of his spiritual father Akṣobhaya.² Mañjuvara forms one of the varieties of the popular god Mañjuśri. The Nālandā image bears all the signs—*Dharmacakramudrā*, Lion-vehicle, *Prajñāṭāramitā* on lotus—except the last, *viz.*, the sitting attitude, which must be either *Lalita* or *Ardhaḍaryāṇīka*, whereas in the figure it is *Paryāṇīka*.³

The finds have yielded one of the most unique types of Tantrayāna or better Kālacakrayāna images in the figure of Yamāntaka. It has three faces, bearing a protruding tongue, canine teeth, two eyes (though the *Sādhana* requires three) and contortions of the brows. It has a big belly, is short and dwarfish..... He carries the sword, *vajra*, *muśala*(?) in the three right hands, and lasso, the *ghantā* and axe (?) in the three left. He rides a buffalo, stands in the *Pratyā-līḍha* attitude, and wears a garland of severed human heads.⁴

Another female figure, though identified as Koṭīśī,⁵ seems to be the image of Vajrasāradā, though she does not fully satisfy the requirement of the *Sādhana*. Here she is sitting in *Bhadrāsana* on a lotus and her companions also have the same attitude; one of the figures carries *utpala* and the book.⁶

(1) Bhattacharyya, o.c., p. 96.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 9 and pl. XII (c).

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 25, pl. XV (b); also *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1919-20, pl. V (a).

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 72, pl. XXVI(b); also *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1920-21, p. 39, pl. I.

(5) *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1919-20, pl. IV (a).

(6) See pl. VII; and Bhattacharyya, o.c., p. 151.

The fragmentary figure on the right is identified with the Buddhist goddess Aparājītā.¹ She is trampling upon Ganeśa. The figure to the right of the principal goddess seems to be Indra, and the rod held by him seems to be the handle of the parasol required to be held by the gods beginning with Brahmā. If the image were not broken, we could have expected the *Caṭetadānamūdrā* in the right hand of the goddess and the *Tarjanīpāśa* in the left, and a parasol in continuation of the broken handle.²

The images of the Hindu pantheon found at Nālandā are those of Viṣṇu, Sūrya (M. No. 1, 887),³ Sarasvatī and Gaṅgā; Balarāma and Anant Vāsudeva (M. No. 1, 442), Śiva, Pārvatī and Ganeśa (M. No. 4, 63 and 90).

We have a very beautiful image of Viṣṇu, prepared in the reign of the Pālā King, Devapāladeva.⁴ “It is a deity standing between two attendants; a hand consisting of snake-head forms a canopy over his head; the attributes are : a small oblong object, a mace, a second mace or staff (!) and the discus. The *vanamālā* hangs down from the shoulders. Of the attendants the one on the proper right bears a vase, and the other a dish with fruits or something similar”.⁵

Kempers has a fine figure of Sarasvatī in *Tribhaiga* pose, with an attendant on either side.⁶ The figure of Gaṅgā is “shown standing on an animal which looks like a blend of elephant and *makara*. Her right hand is hanging down, whilst on the palm of her left hand she lifts a vase to the height of her shoulders.”⁷

(1) See pl. VIII.

(2) Bhattacharyya, o.c., p. 154, pl. XLI (d). For a complete image from the Indian Museum, see *Ibid.*, pl. XLII (a).

(3) The brackets give the registered number of the images in the Nālandā Museum, and the number of the monastery where they were found.

(4) See French, *Art of the Pāla Empire*, pl. X.


(5) Kempers, o.c., p. 36. For another bronze Viṣṇu, from Nālandā, see *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1928-29, pl. LVII (b).

(6) See *Ibid.*, p. 47; fig. 23.

(7) See *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49; fig. 25.



APARAJITA
(FROM NALANDA)



Of the remaining Hindu gods we have neither photographs nor descriptive details but of one, viz., Śiva and Pārvatī. They are sitting on a bull and a lion respectively, in a characteristic pose—Śiva's one hand touching Pārvatī's jaw and that of Pārvatī round the neck of Śiva.¹

Now before we close this topic and take up the question of Nālandā's contribution to Art we shall pass a few remarks on the heterogeneous find of images.

Do the Purānic deities (Śiva, Viṣṇu, Pārvatī and Sarasvatī) along with the representations of the Buddhist hierarchy, as Marshall remarks, bear an eloquent testimony of the general catholicity and eclecticism of the people towards religious faith in later Mediaeval times², or do they show a gradual transformation in the Buddhist faith itself, from pure ethical and agnostic atheism, to theism of the most democratic kind?

More than catholicity and eclecticism, desire for the manifestation of the deity in various moods and forms found in other contemporary faiths—Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism—seems to be the principal cause of such a variety of images. Consequently, there was an attempt made to show the superiority of the Buddhist theistic faith over others as is evidenced by the figures of Heruka and Trailokyavijaya, and Aparājitā who are represented as trampling upon Hara, Pārvatī and Ganeśa.

To take up the query we had raised, to wit, why do not Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing refer to any of the Tāntric images and their forms of worship? Two answers suggest themselves. First, it appears that Tantrayāna, though it had been introduced into Buddhism since about the 5th century, had not yet become very popular, and specially its later developments—Vajrayāna and Kālacakrayāna—made their appearance only in about the 10th century A.D.³ And it was only with these yānas that a

(1) A similar figure has been found, along with other images of the Buddhist pantheon, at a place called Kurkīhār in the Gaya district. See pl. XII.

(2) *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1922-23, p. 107.

(3) See Csonea, *The Origin of the Theory of Ādi Buddha*, *J.A.S.B.*, II. (1833), p. 57.

host of gods and goddesses made their appearance. Secondly, the Chinese travellers confined themselves only to the record of the purer forms of Buddhism and hence they did not like to mention the Tāntric images and their rites. May be that Tāntric rites, as they necessitated secrecy, were not brought to their notice.

The ritualism of Nālandā Buddhism, then, seems to have varied from time to time, as modifications took place in the faith itself. The *Caitiyavandana*, the Ablution of the Holy image (of Buddha), the chanting of *Gāthās*, etc., very likely, were replaced by the individual worship of these Tāntric images. The form and nature of this worship we do not propose to describe. For every Tāntric image had its own form of worship called *Sādhana*,¹ the description of which would take us beyond our task.

(1) See *Sādhanamālā*, I and II, G. O. S., XLI.

CHAPTER VII

STUDENT LIFE

IN this Chapter, we propose to discuss a number of details connected with the daily life of the students of Nālandā and other Universities. Our attention will be confined for the most part to the Buddhist Universities, as, it is with these Universities, that we are dealing here.

For a layman in this subject, it is simply difficult, we may say almost impossible, to imagine what a Buddhist student actually was. Accustomed as he is to see the majority of modern students returning home everyday in the afternoon he will be surprised to know that a Buddhist student passed eight to twelve years at a monastery¹ or a *Gurukula*. If the student was younger than the modern undergraduate, he is not to be confused with a modern schoolboy; when we are told by the *Vinaya Texts* and I-Tsing that he begged, that he did all the household duties of his preceptor², such as sweeping of the floor, we are not to suppose that he was a beggar, that he was merely a domestic servant. If we compare the dress of a modern University student with that of the Buddhist or Hindu student we find that the minimum a modern student requires is a *dhoti*, a shirt, a coat and a cap, apart from the dress of the students who dress in European style; whereas the minimum of the ancient student was:—a *dhoti* and an *uttariya* or an upper garment if he was a Hindu; a robe, dyed yellow and made from rags collected from dust heaps if he was a Buddhist. The reader, as Rashdall says, will

(1) According to I-Tsing the students passed only two or three years at the Universities. I-Tsing, o.c., p. 177.

(2) The word for "preceptor" in Pāli and the one often used in the *Vinaya Texts* is *Upajjhāya* (Sans. *Upādhyāya*).

have to view things historically, and it may be that his imagination will be strained.

As to the equipment with which a student entered upon his University course we have mainly relied upon the accounts of I-Tsing and Hiuen Tsiang, for they were in India for a number of years and possessed first hand information of the working of the Buddhist institutions. Moreover, it is with the Buddhist Universities that we are mainly concerned here.

It appears that the knowledge of Sanskrit was essential for all those—be they Buddhists or Hindus—who wanted to prosecute their studies in Universities.¹ Knowledge of Sanskrit meant a thorough grasping of Sanskrit grammar called *Śabdavidyā* in technical language. This *vidyā*, be it noted, was, so to say, the first step in the attainment of supreme knowledge which could be obtained by *Adhyātmavidyā*, science of the Universal Soul or Philosophy. It comes last in the list of *vidyās*, the intervening ones being *Śilpavidyā* (Art), *Cikitsāvidyā* (Medicine) and *Hetuvidyā* (Logic).

Primary education thus consisted of *Śabdavidyā* (grammar). And the reason why grammar was taught to a student first was possibly this that, in India as well as in Europe, the educationist wanted to impress upon the boy's mind the idea of science, method, order, principle and system of rule.²

Beginners and students six years old studied, what I-Tsing³ calls, *Siddha-composition* and finished it within six months. The book seems to deal with elementary Sanskrit grammar and it was perhaps meant to encourage young students to prosecute their studies further. This inference is supported by the name of the first section of the book "Be there success."⁴ The contents of it, according to I-Tsing, were as follows: "Forty nine letters of the alphabet (which) are combined with one another and arranged in eighteen sections; the total number of syllables is more than 10,000 or more than 300 *ślokas*."

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 169.

(2) See Newman, o.c., Preface, XIX.

(3) I-Tsing, o.c., pp. 170-172.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 170.

This work was originally taught by Maheśvara-deva.

The student, thus, initiated into the elements of grammar, was given the *sūtra* of Pāṇini as it was considered to be the foundation of grammatical science. Usually the student at the age of eight learnt this *sūtra* within eight months. The student at this age learnt *The Book of Dhātu* also.

This knowledge of grammar, however, was considered too elementary. The student was likened to a waste-land and in order to cultivate his mind, the student, when he reached the age of ten, was taught the *Book on the Three Khilas*. The study of this book equipped the student with a thorough knowledge of grammar. The first part of the book treated of the seven cases and ten *Las*, viz., the ten signs with 2 for the verbal tenses, and the eighteen finals, that is, the *Ātmanepada* and *Parasmaipada* forms of a verb with first, second and third person. The second part treated of the formation of words by means of combining a root and a suffix. The third part was almost the same as second. "Three years of diligent study" enabled the student to master this book.

Here, it appears, the secondary education of the student, as far as grammar was concerned, came to an end. Thereafter, he was led into more subtle and abstruse works on grammar. These works, though they professed to be commentaries on grammar, dealt with everything under the Sun. *Vritta Sūtra*, one of the best commentaries on the *sūtra* of Pāṇini, and evidently a book on grammar, besides minutely explaining the meaning of the *sūtra*, "exposed the laws of the Universe, and the regulations of gods and men."¹ The same writer continues, "Boys of fifteen begin to study this commentary and understand it after five years." It is difficult to understand what I-Tsing means by this. The student must be devoting his attention to some other works as well, because five years, for the study of only one work, is too long a period.

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 175.

With *Vṛitti-sūtra*, the study of grammar was over.¹ All these years, efforts to train the memory of the student were made, and he was made to learn everything by heart. But now when he finished the *Vṛitti sūtra* "he began to learn composition in verse and prose." From the study of composition, he passed on to the study of *Hetuvidyā* (Logic) and *Abhidharma-koṣa* (Metaphysics). The student was taught to draw valid and invalid inferences by the study of *Nyāya-dvāra-tarka-sāstra*, while *Jātakamālā* increased his power of comprehension.

Though the knowledge of these subjects was sufficient for a student to enter upon the University career,² still some students for advanced scholarship and thorough mastery over grammatical science studied the undermentioned works.

The *Curnī* of Patañjali and the *Bhartṛihari-sāstra*, a work containing 25,000 ślokas, and dealing with the principles of human life as well as of grammatical science, etc., and finally the *Peina* (probably Sanskrit 'Beda' or *Vēda*) were studied, as we said above by advanced students. Since the last mentioned work, *viz.*, the *Peina*, the *śloka* portion of which was composed by Bhartṛihari, and the commentary portion by Dharmapāla, was read by advanced students also, it appears that all the works were studied by the University students, though perhaps for entrance at Nālandā knowledge of even these was requisite if they thought of proceeding to Nālandā boasting that they were well-informed.³

From the absolute absence of any of the *vidyās* and courses of study mentioned in the curriculum of students, previous to the foundation of the Nālandā University, in the account given by I-Tsing, the reader should not think that the student, prior to his admission to the University, did not study any of the *vidyās* mentioned previously. Some of the *vidyās*, for instance, *Dhanurvidyā*, *Sarpa-vidyā* or *Cikitsā-vidyā* were never

(1) Like I-Tsing, Huien Tsiang's biographer gives a detailed description of grammar as taught at Nālandā. See Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 121-125.

(2) See I-Tsing, p. 177.

(3) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 177. What this 'Beda' actually was, it is difficult to say. See I-Tsing, o.c., p. 225.

meant for all and sundry. Kṣatriya students as a general rule, would go in for archery, and if any one liked to study medicine or anything else, he could also do so in the University.¹ As to other subjects, *Vēdas*, *Vēdānta*, *Sāñkhya*, etc., we have the authority of Hiuen Tsiang who tells us that the student who sought admission in the University of Nālandā must have deeply studied both old and new (books), because the keeper of the gate proposed some hard questions and many being unable to answer had to retire.² The old and the new books are no other than the works on Hinduism,³ such as *Vēdas*, *Vēdāngas*, and *Sāstras-Sāñkhya*, *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, etc., and works on Buddhism, in all its subdivisions. The same conclusion can be deduced from the words of I-Tsing also, who says that the students learn Vinaya works, and *sūtras* and *sāstras* as well.⁴

The student, therefore, before he entered the University of Nālandā, Vikramaśīlā, or Valabhi, had studied much more than our modern school-boy. And, though his knowledge may be favourably compared with our modern graduate, still he was regarded as a school student, until he was enrolled in the University by the gate-keeper.

For this reason, we would consider Nālandā as a University of Universities, entrance to which could be had only after the student had passed out from other smaller and inferior Universities, and the student, not merely a school-boy but a University student wishing to be enrolled in a higher University. Support to this interpretation is lent by the words of I-Tsing⁵ who says, "Here at Nālandā eminent and accomplished men assemble in crowds, discuss possible and impossible doctrines and after having been assured of their opinions by wise men, become far famed for their wisdom." It would be evident from the

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 113.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 171.

(3) Perhaps it would be better to call this division by the dichotomous term "Non-Buddhist," for "Hinduism" is a term of recent origin.

(4) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 181, also p. 104.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 177.

above quotation that students had already distinguished themselves but they traversed all the way to Nālandā from distant parts of India to get that stamp of culture and refinement, which Universities like Oxford and Cambridge give to the modern Indian student.

What was the actual method of teaching followed in the University? Were there lectures, as we have at present addressed to a group of students, sometimes amounting to a hundred or more? Or was it tutorial, meaning that each student or a small group of students was personally attended to by the teacher?

From the records of Hiuen Tsiang, it would appear that the method, in majority of cases, was tutorial. He says,¹ "The old and the young mutually help one another," that is, the old, meaning the teacher, helped the student in his studies by explaining to him the various difficult passages of the book, etc. Hiuen Tsiang himself was taught the *Yoga Śāstra* by Śilabhadra, and many other works, he learnt from Jayasena and others in the same manner.² The student, in his turn, as we shall see elsewhere in detail, assisted the teacher in performing all the domestic and religious duties.

Next to this tutorial method came discussion, and the student acquired much of the knowledge by listening to the discussions which were carried on from morning till night. Both Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing seem to have been very much impressed by this part of Nālandā's activities.³

But, there were some subjects, mainly pertaining to the religious side of Buddhism and not to the philosophical, in which, we can, with some propriety, say that lectures were delivered. Hwui Li is quite clear on this point. He writes, "Within the Temple they arrange every day about 100 pulpits for preaching, and the students attend these discourses without fail, even for a minute."⁴ Even these lectures, very often took

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 17C.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 153-157.

(3) See Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., p. 170; I-Tsing, o.c., p. 177.

(4) o.c., p. 112.

the shape of personal discussion between the teacher and the student, who could not follow the lecture or had some doubts regarding some topics in the lecture.¹ Numerous instances of such nature are met with in the *Vinaya Texts*: *Cullavagga*, *Mahāvagga*, etc. Sometimes, a professor lectured on knotty problems referred to him by the students, who, while discussing among themselves, could not solve them. Or as Buddha very often did, the professor lectured to the whole mass of students on some important problem that he had solved, or on some truth that he had divined.

Whether the students had to do some desk-work is a moot point. But it appears that the only writing work the student had to do, was in the form of copying out manuscripts, the most important of these manuscripts being the *Prajñāpārmitā*. We have got epigraphical evidence to show that copying of manuscripts was one of the important activities of the students.² Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing carried away hundreds of manuscripts from India, and many of them were copied by them, perhaps, at Nālandā. For this purpose, very likely the slabs of stone were carved out in the Buddhist caves, as at Ellora, so that the student could put the book he was reading on the slab and use the same when he wanted to write.

Teaching on the whole was tutorial, more attention being paid to the needs of individual students, rather than a professor coming to the class and lecturing on the particular part of a particular subject as at present in vogue in our colleges.

The Matriculation examination was conducted by the University itself. For this purpose, it had appointed gate-keepers who guarded the way to the higher University studies.

(1) But as regards religious instructions too, tutorial method seems to have been more common Cf. for instance, I-Tsing's words: The candidate begins to learn *Vinaya-pitaka*; he reads it day after day, and is examined every morning. Such is the way a teacher instructs in India. o.c., p. 103.

(2) See Bendall, *Cat. of Buddhist Sans. MSS. in the Univ. Liby.*, Cambridge, p. 101. Also *J.A.S.B.*, N.S., IV, p. 105.

The examination consisted of a few questions, which were put to all those who came from other quarters, as strangers, with a desire to join the University and take part in the discussions. The amount of knowledge these students were expected to possess, we have seen, in the preceding paragraphs.

From the number of unsuccessful students, which was seven or eight in ten, it is evident that the examination must have been very strict. Students of moderate talent were not only bound to fail to get admission but by their non-admission they even forfeited their fame as eminent debators.¹ This entrance examination, as it is clear from words like "other quarters" and "strangers," seems to have been held for those students, who had not received their 'primary' and 'secondary' education at Nālandā. But for students who had received their 'primary' and 'secondary' education at Nālandā and who were generally those who had embraced Buddhism, no such examination was necessary. They had to study, first, the Buddhist works and then works of other faiths and systems.² Then in course of time, when they had finished certain works, they were placed in charge of various departments of the University, majority of them being appointed as *ācāryas*.

We have seen with what knowledge the student entered the University, and how he received education in it. Let us now follow him to the University and see how he lived there.

If we rely solely upon I-Tsing for our knowledge then the minimum age at which a student obtained admission at Nālandā or Valabhi would be twenty, because, at the age of fifteen a boy just began his study of *Vṛittisūtra* and he finished it at the age of twenty.³ Having mastered this, he learnt such subjects as *Hetuvidyā* (Logic) and *Abhidharmaśā* (Metaphysics). After studying all this, to quote the same author, "(The students) thus instructed by their teachers and instructing others, they pass two or three years, generally in the Nālandā

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 171.

(2) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 181.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 175.

monastery in Central India or in the country of Valabhi in Western India."¹

But the statement of I-Tsing, we think, applies to those students who went to Nālandā to get the Nālandā-seal on the knowledge and culture already obtained by them.

We think, therefore, that there must be other students who had passed their whole career at Nālandā, primarily as *Bhikkhus*. Such students must have entered the University not at the age of twenty but at least some five to seven years before, just after they had finished their studies in grammar.² For these students, Nālandā was not the University of Universities but merely a school for secondary education, from which they were gradually to pass on to Nālandā, the University.

Thus we have two ages at which a student entered the University;—one at which the outsiders, for example, Dharmapāla and Śilabhadra, entered the University, the minimum for which would be twenty; and the other, at which young *Bhikkhus* joined the *saṅgha*, the minimum for which would be thirteen or fifteen.

Our main source of information on the state of discipline observed and maintained in the Nālandā University and other Buddhist institutions are the *Vinaya Texts*, which deal with rules and regulations prescribed from time to time by Buddha to be observed by what the *Texts* sometimes call “*Saddhivihārika*” and sometimes “*Śiṣyas*” and in general *Bhikkhus*. Perhaps more important than these codes of discipline are the contemporary accounts of the Chinese travellers, who had the opportunity to be eye-witnesses to the University colleges in action.

Our University student was strikingly different from the Mediæval European University student, as far as liberty was concerned. If the reader of books on Mediæval European

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 177.

(2) As a matter of fact, we have the testimony of I-Tsing, who says that students who entered Buddhist institutions were of two classes—one were *Bhiksus* (whom he calls *mānavas*), and the other *Brahmacārins* (students), o.c., pp. 105-106. This division, we think, corresponds to the one we have suggested.

Universities would be astonished, as Rashdall¹ thinks, at the unfettered liberty—not to say the licence—which the European student enjoyed, the reader of books on ancient Indian Universities would be astonished at what may be called serfdom, which the Indian student had to go through, in order to acquire education. But what we term ‘serfdom’ now, was deemed as duty from the Indian standpoint, and therefore the student did not feel the restraint that was put upon his freedom. The following passage from I-Tsing tells us how completely the student gave himself up to the teacher for the acquisition of knowledge, which could never be dreamt of, in the Europe of the Middle Ages nor even in modern India. Says the traveller, “ He goes to his teacher at the first watch and at the last watch in the night. First the teacher bids him sit down comfortably. (Selecting some passages) from the *Tripiṭakas*, he gives a lesson in a way that suits circumstances, and does not pass any fact or theory unexplained. He inspects his pupil’s moral conduct, and warns him of defects and transgressions. Whenever he finds his pupil faulty, he makes him seek remedies and repent. The pupil rubs the teacher’s body, folds his clothes, or sometimes sweeps the apartment and the yard. Then having examined water to see whether insects be in it, he gives it to the teacher. Thus if there be anything to be done, he does all on behalf of his teacher.”²

This was true of all resident students and generally a major part of the students was of resident students. If the passage speaks of the Buddhist students, it is equally true of a Hindu student, excepting such work as the examining of water etc., which was peculiar to the Buddhists. Hindu religious codes, *Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra*,³ for instance, speak at length of the behaviour of the student towards the teacher, of the day to day examination of the pupil’s morals and of many other things.

(1) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 605.

(2) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 120.

(3) *adhyāya* II.

The reason why the Indian student willingly underwent so much subjection, while his European brother was almost immune from such hardships, nay, on the contrary enjoyed unimaginable luxuries is to be found in the fact that the Indian paid no fees to his teacher. After the completion of his education, the student paid whatever he liked, and whatever he could to his preceptor. All preceptors, we think, did not pitch their demand so high when the pupil humbly asked the preceptor as to what he should pay him, as the preceptor of Kālidāsa's Kautsa.¹ The teacher, in his turn, as he took no fees, made the student to work in his *āśrama* or *vihāra*, as his domestic life must be carried on. So, very often besides doing the work of the preceptor as shown above, the student had to go for alms. This was true of the Buddhist *saṅghas* and monasteries also. For, in the beginning, when the *saṅgha* was started by Buddha, gifts of land, corn and other household requirements were not coming so freely as when the kings and wealthy people accepted Buddhism as a faith and made rich gifts to the *saṅgha*, built monasteries and equipped them with all the necessities of life. The custom of serving the preceptor, introduced by Buddha, was handed down from generation to generation and we find it being followed even in the time of I-Tsing.

Circumstances, however, were different in Europe. The student paid fees in Europe and so we meet with a strange spectacle of a touting Master visiting a freshman, "anxious to secure the new-comer for his own Hall or lecture room."² Instead of a student approaching the Master we find the Master going out in search of students. And the contrast cannot be more striking than when we read that "In the matter of lectures, indeed, a trial was respectfully solicited with all the accommodating obsequiousness of a modern tradesman."³

(1) *Raghuvamśa*, canto V, verse 21 and ff.

(2) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 606.

(3) *Ibid.*

No one need think that the Indian student, as a strict watch was kept over his morals and movements, did not commit any immoral act or violate the discipline in any way. In fact, acts of immorality and transgression of ordinary rules of discipline gave rise to the various regulations in the *Pātimokkha*. Buddha prescribed rules from time to time, as acts of omission and commission were brought to his notice. Perusal of *Vinaya Texts* clearly shows this. But, if the rules of discipline were rigorous¹ they were not so spartan in their execution in the sense that the students were not imprisoned nor birched, as the European undergraduates were.² Corporal punishment there was none. The highest punishment was expulsion from the monastery for serious acts of immorality.³ Otherwise, the offence fell under various heads of offences mentioned in the *Vinaya Texts*⁴ and the punishment for them was to practise penance by the modes prescribed by Buddha.

The European student was free from the rigours of discipline in the 12th and 13th centuries. But, the colleges that sprang up in the 15th and 16th centuries enforced a very strict discipline upon the students. And "this discipline reacted upon the discipline of the Halls and of the Universities generally."⁵ Henceforward, the European student came very near the Indian student in point of discipline. And as regards punishment, in fact, he was more severely dealt with than the Indian.

From this, we pass on to a topic which is intimately connected with the one already discussed, and which in fact comprises the question of discipline and many other kindred questions. This topic is the relation between the teacher and the taught. On this question also, the Hindu and the

(1) Cf. Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170, who says, "The rules of this convent (Nālandā) are severe, and the conduct of priests pure and unblamable."

(2) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 609.

(3) *Pātimokkha, Saṅghādisesā Dhammā*.

(4) *Ibid., Nissaggiyā Pākittiyā Dhammā*.

(5) See Rashdall, o. c., II, p. 623.

Buddhist codes of conduct have almost the same outlook. The reason is that the whole idea of Buddhist *saṅgha*, monasticism and so forth was modelled upon the Hindu practice of sending young students to an *āśrama* of *guru*, or *ācārya* to serve and to study under him. Buddha, indeed, says in so many words that "I prescribe, O *Bhikkhus*, (that young *Bhikkhus* choose) a preceptor."¹ Continuing, he lays down the relation that is to exist between them. "The preceptor, O *Bhikkhus*," says Buddha,² "ought to consider the pupil as a son; the pupil ought to consider the preceptor as a father." Such a relationship held out a very noble reward both to the teacher and the taught. For these two united by mutual reverence, confidence, and communion of life, would progress, advance, and reach a high stage in doctrine and discipline.³

Thus initiating the subject, Buddha proceeds to mention the actual duties of the pupil and the teacher respectively towards each other. First the pupil's.

"Let him arise betimes, and having taken off his shoes and adjusted his upper robe so as to cover one shoulder let him give to the preceptor the teeth-cleanser and water to rinse his mouth with. Then let him prepare a seat (for the preceptor). If there is rice-milk, let him rinse the jug, and offer rice-milk (to the preceptor). When he has drunk it, let him give water (to the preceptor).".....Getting up early in the morning, the pupil was to help the teacher in all the ceremonies and practices of the first hours of the day. Going for alms was the next item of the day and in this the pupil had to follow the preceptor if the latter so desired. The pupil had to make all arrangements for the teacher's meals and cleanse the bowls, etc. Sometimes the pupil had even to sweep the *vihāra*. More important things than the above were the following: "The pupil was also to act as a check, as it were, upon the preceptor, in keeping him steadfast in the faith. If he became discontented the pupil was to try and appease him or get some one else to do this. If indecision

(1) *Mahāvagga*, I, 25.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*

arose in his mind or he had become tainted with false doctrines the pupil was to try and win him back. If the preceptor was guilty of a grave offence, the pupil was to take care that the *sāṅgha* sentenced him to discipline and also that he was rehabilitated after the penance was complete, but he was at the same time to get the *sāṅgha* to forego, or mitigate, any severe discipline which it might wish to impose upon his preceptor. He was not to accept or give presents or wait on any one else, or go out, without the permission of the preceptor. If the preceptor was sick he was to wait upon him and nurse him diligently.”¹

The relation, therefore, between the teacher and the taught was that of a master and a servant, of a superior and an inferior, of a patient and a nurse. The primary relation was that of a teacher and a pupil; the others were its offshoots but they were of no little importance.

To give, in Buddha's own words, the duties of the preceptor towards the pupil: “The former ought to observe a strict conduct towards the latter. Let the preceptor, O *Bhikkhus*, afford (spiritual) help and furtherance to the pupil by teaching, by putting questions to him, by exhortation, by instruction.”² Just as the pupil was to be a nurse to the teacher when ill, so also the teacher in his turn was required to wait upon and nurse the pupil, when the latter fell ill.³

Very few instances of feuds with the teacher are met with in Hindu as well as Buddhist works. One specific case mentioned by *Cullavagga*—one of the parts of the *Vinaya Texts*—is that of Devadatta. This disciple of Buddha not only severed his connection with Buddha but went even further. He attempted first himself and when he failed, induced Ajātaśatru—the son and successor of King Bimbisāra of Maghada—to take

(1) Keay, *Ancient Indian Education*, p. 91-92.

(2) *Mahāvagga*, I, 26.

(3) The relation thus is almost identical with that expressed in the opening and closing prayer of many of the *Upaniṣads*, *vis.*,

Saha nāvavatu, Saha nau bhunaktu, Saha viryam karavāvahai tejas-vināvadhītamastu, Mā vidviśāvahai. See for instance *Taittiriya*, III.

the life of Buddha. Such cases were however very rare. If a digression be permitted, then we may cite the case of Yājñavalkya¹ mentioned in the *Purāṇas* where the disciple Yājñavalkya was asked by his teacher, Vaiśampāyana, to give back whatever he had learnt from him on account of some quarrel that took place between them. But this calm submission to the teacher's order, even if it be unjust and autocratic, could be expected only from an Indian student, for he was brought up in an atmosphere, where strict obedience was the rule. Students of the Paris University, we are told,² brought an action against the faculty, under which they were studying, before the Parliament, and boldly pleaded for the degree, which was refused to them. Yājñavalkya, in these days, will be perhaps condemned for his deed; obedience may be construed as cowardice. But, those times were such, when an appeal against the teacher's order was unheard of, and even if some one wanted to appeal he did not know where to lodge his appeal, for, even though, the king was the sole authority, the Brāhmins, who were usually the teachers, were considered superior to and more powerful than the king. So, the king dared not lift his head against the teacher.³

What was the dress of the Indian student? Did he have any special academical dress, as the students of Bologna and other European Universities had? And, even if there was any special dress for students was it compulsory for all? These are some of the questions with which we shall have to deal, while speaking about the life of an Indian University student.

Rules about the dress of a Hindu student, that is, a *Brahmacārin* are given in the *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*⁴ and many other such *Sūtra* works and *Smṛtis*. The form, etc., of the dress was the same whether the student was a Brāhmin, a Kṣatriya

(1) *Śrimad Bhāgavat*, skandha XII, adhyāya 6.

(2) Rashdall, o. c., I, p. 470.

(3) Often times we come across stories where a king was punished for going against the wish of the Brāhmin. See *Śrimad Bhāgavat*, skandha X, adhyāya 64.

(4) *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*, adhyāya I, sūtra 29.

or a Vaiśya but the quality of the cloth and other paraphernalia relating to the dress varied according to his caste.

No such distinctions, however, were to be found among the Buddhists. For with them, there was no caste; all people were same to them. Now, the dress that was prescribed by Buddha for a *Bhikkhu* was to be the dress of a student also. Very little difference was made between a student and a *Bhikkhu*. A student, in fact, as long as he was in a monastery was guided by the same rules and regulations that were prescribed for a *Bhikkhu*. The dress of a student who studied at Buddhist monasteries, where *Bhikkhus* also resided, must be like that of the *Bhikkhus*. We shall, therefore, see what the dress of a *Bhikkhu* was.

The *Bhikkhu* used to put on a robe. As to the cloth that was to be used in the preparation of a robe, we find that Buddha was very liberal in his views. Unlike the authors of *Smṛtis* and *Sūtras* he allowed such rich cloth as silk and wool, besides linen, cotton, and hemp.¹ Gautama and others have laid down that *Brahmacārins* should only use a garment made of hemp, linen, rags, etc.² But, if Buddha thus appears to be very broadminded when compared with writers on *Smṛtis* and *Sūtras* one condition that he had laid down regarding dress was very strict. The *Bhikkhus* could not go to the market and buy one robe length of cotton or silk or wool, for Buddha³ had prescribed that a set of robes made entirely from un torn pieces was not to be worn. In order that *Bhikkhus* should refrain from violating this rule he also laid down that a person who would break the rule would be guilty of a *Dukkhati* offence⁴.

Now, there were three such robes.⁵ One was a double waist-cloth, the other a single upper robe, and the third was a single under garment. In a note to this passage the trans-

(1) *Mahāvagga*, VIII, 1.

(2) Gautama, o. c., I, *sūtra* 19.

(3) *Mahāvagga*, o. c., VIII, 21, 2.

(4) *Ibid.*, VIII, 21, 2.

(5) *Ibid.*, VIII, 31, 54.

lator tells us how these garments were used. "The waist cloth," says he, "was wrapped round the waist and back, and secured with a girdle. The under garment was wrapped round the loins and reached below the knee, being fastened round by an end of the cloth being tucked in there, and sometimes also by a girdle. The upper robe was wrapped round the legs from the loins to the ankles, and the end was then drawn, at the back, from the right hip, over the left shoulder, and either allowed to fall down in front, or drawn back again over the right shoulder, and allowed to fall down on the back." The colour of the garment was usually yellow.¹

Now this dress was evidently ecclesiastical or religious, for, it was primarily the dress of the priests and *Bhikkhus*. I-Tsing also calls it a religious garment.² But, we may call it academical as the students also put on the same dress. Whether there was any head-dress for the students, we cannot definitely say. *Vinaya Texts*, at least, are silent on this point, and hence, Dr. Vidyabhusana³ concludes that "in the early Buddhist Church, monks (and so also the students) were not allowed to wear any head-dress." However, "With the introduction of *Mahāyāna*," continues the same writer, "in the first century A.D. by Kaniṣka, a great change was effected in the dress of monks, and caps of various shapes were invented."⁴ Then he proceeds to describe a picture of Ācārya Diññāga, who was a great logician and a distinguished professor of Nālandā. This picture therefore gives a good idea about the dress of the Nālandā professors. The picture represents Diññāga with a cap having a pointed peak and long lappets. In Tibetan it was called Panchen-shwa-dmar or 'Pandita's red cap'. The length of the lappets of the cap was in proportion to the rank of the wearer. If, as Dr. Vidyabhusana says, that a Pandita's cap was perhaps a distinctive badge of the scholars of the

(1) *Mahāvagga*, VIII, 10, 1; Cf. I-Tsing, o. c., pp. 72-73-74.

(2) I-Tsing, o. c., p. 72.

(3) Vidyabhusana, o. c., p. 78; *H.I.L.*, p. 271.

(4) *Ibid.*

Nālandā University¹ then we can at least infer that the students must have had some kind of head-dress and possibly similar to that worn by Ācārya Diññāga.

The records at our disposal are seldom sufficient to enable us to say exactly how many times in a day the students took their meals. This much, however, is certain that three meals, *viz.*, breakfast, lunch, and supper, which our modern students are accustomed to, were quite unknown to the Nālandā student, and in fact to all the students of ancient India. If there was something like our morning tea, which I-Tsing² calls morning meal with reference to the teacher, and simpler meal with reference to the pupil, the time for such a meal was quite different. Unlike the modern student, the ancient student could not take tea which consisted of rice-water³ immediately after cleaning his teeth, for after chewing his tooth-wood,⁴ he had to wait upon his teacher.⁵ And this would at least require an hour, after which the teacher partook of his cup of rice-water and then came the turn of the student. The actual time, according to the commentator Kāśyapa, for this meal, was just after sunrise.⁶ This rice-water, being more substantial than our tea or coffee, may as well be called a breakfast.

The next meal, it appears, was at 12 o'clock, forenoon.⁷ Even this meal, as I-Tsing says, was sometimes delayed till the afternoon.⁸ Rice, butter, milk,⁹ fruits, and sweet melons,¹⁰

(1) Vidyabhusana, *H.I.L.*, p. 272.

(2) I-Tsing, o. c., p. 117.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) "Toothwood" is even now the most common way of cleaning the teeth in India. The wood is a small, cylindrical, tender branch of either the "Neem" or "Babul," tree.

(5) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 117.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 117, n.

(7) *Ibid.*, p. 26.

(8) *Ibid.*

(9) Hwui Li, o. c., p. 113. Cf. also I-Tsing, o. c., pp. 43-44.

(10) I-Tsing, o. c., p. 44.

were usually taken by students for their food. All these provisions were contributed by two hundred householders from about hundred villages.¹ Whether there was any equivalent of our afternoon tea, or even the evening supper, we are not in a position to say, though we think that there must be some evening meal at about 7 o'clock.

From the above remarks, it would seem that our Indian student was not quite well-off in the matter of food, or that he was rather starved. If, however, we turn to the Oxford student of the 12th and 13th centuries, we shall be surprised to find that "so far as regular meals of college are concerned, no provision was usually made for any food before dinner at 10 A.M."² Thus the Oxford student had nothing like breakfast, nor tea. In this respect his Indian brother, as we have seen, was better provided. But, though we find no mention of breakfast for the Oxford student, we are definitely told that he had his supper at 5 P. M.³ On Fast-days, however, even this supper disappeared.⁴ It would be evident from this comparative study that the Indian student was, on the whole, much more cared for in the matter of food than the English.

Though the provisions of food at Nālandā were supplied by the householders from the adjacent villages and the students—*Bhikkhus* as well as *Brahmacārins*—as the biographer of Hiuen Tsiang says, were abundantly supplied and so did not require to ask for the four requisites, *viz.*, clothes, food bedding, and medicine,⁵ still we learn from I-Tsing that both kinds of students above mentioned had to pay for their own subsistence.⁶ From other sources we learn that the students had to go for alms every day.⁷ We have, thus, three state-

(1) Hwui Li, o. c., p. 112.

(2) Rashdall, o. c., II, p. 653-654.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 654.

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) Hwui Li, o. c., p. 113.

(6) I-Tsing, o. c., p. 105-106.

(7) *Mahāvagga*, I, 25 and 26.

ments as to the way in which the students were provided, each totally contradicting the other. If, as I-Tsing tells us, the student had to pay for his own maintenance, it will give rise to another query as to the standard of living of the student. I-Tsing's statement, however, is opposed to all that we know about Hindu or Buddhist system of education. Nowhere, in any Hindu work do we come across a single reference that tells us that the student had to pay for his own livelihood. All that we learn from these works is that the students either begged not only for themselves but even for their teachers or, as Hwui Li tells us, they were maintained by rich citizens or kings.¹

A reference to the question of morality was made when we spoke about the discipline of students. An Indian student who lived in the *āśrama* of a *guru* had very few occasions when he could come into contact with women. Even on those few occasions he had to act in strict conformity with the rules laid down by religious codes.² His chances of going astray, consequently, were very few. Matters were different, however, with students who took education in Buddhist institutions. These were open to nuns, and so side by side with male students, women also lived. Hence, the students had greater scope of association with women. Every possible precaution was, therefore, taken to dissuade the students from acts of immorality. Whenever a woman entered a monastery, she was not allowed to proceed to the apartments of either priests or students; she could only speak to them in a corridor, and go away.³ From an instance cited by I-Tsing it would seem that the students and priests alike were very sensitive on this question of morality. For a teacher who sent to a tenant's wife two *Shang* (*prastha*) of rice gratis, resigned his post, out of sheer shame when this incident was reported to the assembly, even though the assembly declared that he had commit-

(1) Hwui Li, o. c., p. 113. According to the *Jātakas*, e.g., II, pp. 277-78., however the students had the option before them either to pay the fees or to attend upon the teacher.

(2) Gautama, o. c., adhyāya II, sūtras 24 and 40-41.

(3) I-Tsing, o. c., p. 63.

ted no crime.¹ Though instances such as these would show that the students as well as teachers scarcely violated the code of morality we are inclined to say from other sources that acts of immorality must have been committed at least in the later centuries, that is to say, in the 9th and 10th centuries. Buddhist religion at this time was in a very decadent state.² Advent of new cults such as *Mantrayāna*, and so many other *yānas* had led their devotees to produce all sort of rubbish and trash literature. Many base and immoral practices were advocated. And we can just imagine what must be the actual deeds of these persons when they openly wrote on such subjects. It was only in the 11th century that Atiśa and others restored Buddhism to its pristine position. For, even though they were the exponents of *Mantras* and *Dhāraṇīs* they moved in a much higher sphere than their predecessors.³

Some cases of immoral acts are even mentioned by *Vinaya Texts*.⁴ And Buddha had prescribed the maximum punishment for it, viz., excommunication from the *saṅgha*.⁵

Before we go to another aspect of the student-life, it may be noted, so far as its morality is concerned, that none of the Chinese travellers, neither Hiuen Tsiang, nor I-Tsing, refers to any instance of immorality. No one need say that the tourists painted only the better side of the picture. Even a cursory glance at the index of Takakusu's translation of I-Tsing's records will show to the reader that the tourist is admirably or shall we say surprisingly frank in his records of what he saw in India. He never misses an opportunity of pointing out the superiority of his country, which he calls the country of gods, over India, in its customs, manners, etc. This also points to the fact that he was not a mere

(1) *Ibid.*

(2) Vasu, *Modern Buddhism*, Introduction, p. 4.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 6.

(4) *Cullavagga*, 1, 13, 1.

(5) *Pātimokkha*, *Aniyatā Dhammā*.

admirer or a flatterer of India, even though much of his writing contains nothing but admiration for India. From the absence of any reference by these travellers to the morality of the students we may assume that the standard of morality must be very high.

Since games and sports are of supreme interest to modern students, the question may be asked whether the students of ancient India had a similar fondness for amusements, and whether they were allowed any.

Writers of Hindu *Dharmaśāstras* and *Smṛtis* would have us believe that students of yore had no craving for any kind of games, save gambling with dice. Gautama¹, while speaking about the duties of a student, lays down the rule that a student should always keep away from gambling, etc. In one whole chapter devoted to the life of the student this is the only reference he makes to an amusement out of so many amusements that we know of. Since Gautama does not tell us of the games that the student used to play, it follows that the students indulged in no other sport but gambling. Gautama, however, strictly forbids gambling. We are, therefore, compelled to arrive at the conclusion to which Rashdall arrived, in the case of the Mediaeval European Universities, *viz.*, that "a very striking feature of medieval University life is the almost total absence of authorized or respectable amusements."² But as far as ancient India is concerned, there appears to be a total absence of authorised or respectable amusements.

If we turn from the Hindu Works to the Buddhist we find that they give an exhaustive list of games, and even though many of them were innocent and absolutely harmless, they were banned.

Even though the work speaks of the games that were prohibited, nevertheless, it gives us very valuable information as to the games that existed in India. We read in the *Cullavagga*, that besides dancing with ladies, the *Bhikkhus*

(1) Gautama, *Dharmaśātra*, adhyāya II, sūtra 23.

(2) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 669.

"used to amuse, themselves at games with eight pieces and ten pieces, and with tossing up, hopping over diagrams formed on the ground, and removing substances from a heap without shaking the remainder; and with games of dice and trap ball; and with sketching rude figures, tossing balls, blowing trumpets, having matches at ploughing with mimic ploughs, tumbling, forming mimic wind-mills, guessing at measures, having chariot races and archery matches, shooting marbles with the fingers, guessing other people's thoughts, and mimicking other people's acts;—and they used to practise elephant riding, and horse riding, carriage driving and swordsmanship;—and they used to run to and fro in front of horses and in front of carriages;—and they used to exhibit signs of anger, and to wring their hands, and to wrestle, and to box with their fists;—and spreading their robes out as a stage they used to invite dancing girls, saying 'Here you may dance, sister' and greet her with applause."¹

Many of the above-mentioned amusements, for instance hopping over figures, boxing, wrestling and the like, it will be admitted, were absolutely innocent. But before we criticize the orthodox attitude of the ancient writers, let us see how many of the amusements we can recognise as similar to modern amusements.

Wrestling and boxing are evidently referred to in the words 'they used to wrestle and to box with their fists.' Chariot races are nowadays replaced by horse races, and archery by target-shooting, which our undergraduates practise in the U.T.C. Camp. The game of hopping over diagrams is still a favourite sport with Hindus. There are two such games current among them. One is usually played by young boys and girls. In it the player has to hop on one leg. The other game is more intelligent and skilful. Grown-up persons and young children alike play this game. Here the play mainly consists in crossing three or four squares without being caught by players of the opposite side. In vernacular this game is called

(1) *Cullavagga*, I, 13, 2.

‘Ātā-pātā.’ Since the game is spoken of in connexion with grown-up persons, probably it is the latter game that is referred to and not the former, which is only resorted to by young children.

But of greater importance than the identification of various amusements are the expressions such as “Mimicking other people’s acts,” “Exhibiting signs of anger,” and the last lines which speak of dancing. In these, perhaps, there is an allusion to the drama. And if it can be proved that the art of dramatising had developed so early as the 5th century B.C. much new light can be thrown upon the alleged Greek influence on the Indian drama. An exhaustive and critical study of all Buddhist works, prior to the invasion of Alexander the Great, with whom many actors and others are believed to have come to India and implanted the Greek drama—especially its peculiarities, for instance, the *Yavanikā*—would bring nearer the solution of the vexed problem. There is no doubt that the games spoken of, including the drama, belong to the pre-Alexander invasion, and to the Buddha and the post-Buddha period. For even allowing a space of a hundred years to elapse in which the *Vinaya Texts* came to be collected and, so to say, codified, to meet the argument that the games referred to may not really have existed in the time of Buddha, but may have reference to things found in the years that followed the death of Buddha, even then, the original theory remains untouched. And even if references to the games of the Buddha-age be disproved, they will and must refer to the interval between the death of Buddha and the Greek invasion, during which period the various *Vinaya Texts* came to be codified.

One is really surprised at the attitude of the authors of these codes. Did they think that the students should not see the lighter side of life, however innocent? But if the attitude of those who moulded the character and life of the students appears surprising, that of the students is still more surprising. With all due regard for their sense of duty, for obedience to

their teachers and parents, to all their elders, it must be said that in spite of these commendable virtues, their ready obedience showed sometimes their servility of nature. Otherwise how could they not tell their teachers and all other superiors that they must have some authorised amusements? For they did indulge in amusements; they were not puritans. And gambling, which even nowadays is considered a vice, was their favourite pastime. This is evident from the fact that we meet with universal condemnation of gambling in both Hindu as well as Buddhist works. The condemnation itself suggests that dice-playing must have been very popular. And this suggestion is based on the oft-repeated argument of the Hindu philosophers that there could be no negation of a thing which did not exist.¹ Hence gambling must have been a very popular pastime, otherwise it could not be spoken ill of by the writers who in order to check the ever-growing vice seemed to have taken up cudgels against it and determined to make a concerted attack on it. In spite of all the efforts of these well-wishers of the students, gambling had made its way into the precincts of the Nālandā University. This is conclusively proved from the find of a gaming die by the excavators at Nālandā. The comments of Mr. Page² are worth quoting. "Another curious find was a gaming die, which seems to suggest that the Buddhist brethren here were not altogether above the amusements of less austere humanity." He further adds, "Similar gaming dice had previously been recovered in Monasteries No. I and IA as well as on many other Buddhist sites."

The above evidence establishes beyond doubt that the students of Nālandā must have been addicted to gambling. And if they played at dice, why should they not indulge in games—all those that are mentioned by *Cullavagga*—which are obviously more innocent, and really healthy? The more we think of this question of games, the more are we inclined to think that the games which tempted the *Bhikkhus* of Buddha,

(1) Cf. Śāṅkara, *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*, adhyāya II, sūtra 18.

(2) *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1923-24, p. 74.

the *Bhikkhus* who had renounced the world, must have had a greater temptation for the students of Nālandā. For these students were not *sanyāsis*, many of them had a stake in the world, cherished high ambitions and moreover, they all lived in a crowd where the temptations are many, and easily fallen a prey to. Again if the *Bhikkhus* of Buddha could not resist the temptations, how could the students who, in spite of the able and distinguished abbots as Dharmapāla, Atiśa and others, were without such a spiritual head as Buddha? Human nature being the same in all ages, it would not be proper to say that the students in ancient India were puritans. And, if we see the students of our time so very fond of all kinds of sports we cannot believe the students of ancient India to have been otherwise.¹

The reader will wonder why, instead of speaking of the number of students at the Nālandā University, we speak of the numbers in various Universities. The reasons for so doing are mainly two. The first reason is to review briefly the statements made by writers at different periods about educational institutions which also varied in point of time and character. The second reason is closely allied to the first. The review, as we have above contemplated, will enable us to know the comparative strength of the institutions, whereas the relative idea will enable us to determine the exact position of the Nālandā University, among other Universities.

Starting as early as the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*, we meet with several references to the famous teachers, to whom students flocked for knowledge from all quarters. Many of these teachers have been called "*Kulapatis*." The word "*Kulapati*" is interpreted to signify the head of a number of students, even as many as 10,000.² But this, as we said, is

(1) In this connexion Tagore (*My Reminiscences*, p. 72.) has very rightly said, "The book of Boy Nature is even older and also more authentic".

(2) Cf. the following verse, cited, evidently, from some *Smṛti*: *Muninām daśasāhasram yonna dānāni poṣanāt, adhyāpayati viprarṣih asau kulapatiḥ smṛtaḥ.*

only an interpretation. There is no documentary evidence to show that there really existed a number as large as 10,000.

Takṣaśilā, as an educational centre, has been made famous by the *Jātaka* stories and other Buddhist works. One of them tells us that a student, who proceeded to Takṣaśilā to learn *Silpa*, had five hundred class-mates.¹

But we tread on much surer ground, when we read the records of the Chinese travellers. Fa-hien speaks of two monasteries at Pāliputra—modern Patna—where resided six to seven hundred monks. Besides Buddhist monks, there were students also who had repaired thither in search of truth.² These monks must be lay devotees, but learned in Buddhist as well as other contemporary philosophies. If, there were so many learned monks the number of students who approached them must be evidently much larger. Even a most moderate estimate would come to one thousand.

Next, in point of time is Hiuen Tsiang. Before recording his impressions about Nālandā, he refers to another monastery, Tilaḍaka. Scholars are not unanimous as to the exact location of this monastery. According to Cunningham, it is the modern Tillāra, while Fergusson locates it in the Barabara hills.³ “It was a large and famous establishment flourishing in the 7th century—about 20 miles to the west of Nālandā.”⁴ Here 1000 priests carried on study in Mahāyāna, and learned men from different cities and scholars from distant countries flocked together in crowds, and having reached so far, abode in the *sāṅghārāma*.⁵ The number of students must be, when there were about 1000 priests, more than 2000. We can safely put it down to 1500 to 2000.

Hiuen Tsiang does not tell us about the actual number of students at Nālandā. His account, in this respect, is very

(1) *Dhammapadāṭṭīhakathā*, Pali Text Society Edition, I, p. 250.

(2) Fa-hien, o.c., pp. 78-79.

(3) See Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 107.

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, pp. 102-103.

vague. Says he, “ The priests, to the number of several thousands, are men of the highest ability and talent.”¹ His biographer—Shaman Hwui Li—however, sheds more light on this question. He writes, “ The *Saṅghārāmas* of India are counted by myriads, but this is the most remarkable for grandeur and height. The priests, belonging to the convent, or strangers (*residing therein*) always reach to the number of 10,000.” That all these occupants were students is clear from the lines that follow. Continuing he says, “ Who all study the Great Vehicle, and also (the works belonging to) the eighteen sects, and not only so, but even ordinary works, such as the *Vēdas* and other books, the *Hetuvidyā*, *Śabdavidyā*, the *Chikitsāvidyā*, the works on Magic (*Atharvavēda*), the *Sāñkhya*; besides these, they thoroughly investigate the ‘ miscellaneous ’ works.”²

Assuming that 10,000 is an exaggeration, because the ancient chronicler was generally prone to be grandiloquent—specially where figures were concerned—and took delight in good round numbers, still taking into consideration other circumstances—especially the fame of Nālandā as a knowledge-resort—we can say that the number of students must be approximately 3000 to 5000. Moreover, this estimate comes very near the number mentioned by I-Tsing. “ The number of priests in the Nālandā monastery,” writes I-Tsing “ is immense, and exceeds three thousand.”³ If I-Tsing refers both to students and priests, who were their professors, even then the number is pretty large; if, however, he refers to students only, then, as we have argued while speaking of other Universities, the number of students would be more than 3000. This number we have already deduced from Hiuen Tsiang’s records.

We might conclude, therefore, that the number of students at Nālandā must have been about 4000.

Of other Universities—Vikramaśilā, Odantapuri, and Jāgad-dala—we have no records as to the number of students studying

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 170.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 112.

(3) o.c., p. 154.

therein. *Vikramaśilā*, we know from Taranath and other sources, grew up in the 8th century A. D., and rivalled with *Nālandā*. From this, we may gather that, like *Nālandā*, it must have been also a great University; and that it had also a large number of students.

Nālandā, it will be evident, ranks first among other earlier and later Universities as far as number goes.

Among other reasons why *Nālandā* beats other similar institutions in the number of students studying therein, two stand out most conspicuously. *Nālandā*, at first, was the one institution which, though primarily Buddhist, welcomed students of other faiths as well. In this respect, *Nālandā* may be compared with great many Jesuit Colleges in India, which, though founded originally only for the Christians, threw open their doors to other non-Christians also. The Jesuit College in Bombay has the largest number of students among all the colleges in Bombay.

The second reason is that, unlike *Takṣaśilā* and other Universities which were famed for their specialisation in medicine and other sciences, *Nālandā* imparted knowledge in all the heterogeneous arts and sciences, philosophies and religions.¹ If Buddhism was specially attended to, Vedāntism, etc., were not neglected. Likewise, place was made even for *Cikitsāvidyā* (science of medicine) in the curriculum. Thus, at *Nālandā* a student could learn whatever he wanted to learn. Whereas, in other institutions, if a student was dissatisfied with his subject, he had either to leave it along with the institution or continue the study of it against his will, *Nālandā* gave him an opportunity to change the subject by remaining at the same place. An institution, which looked after the needs of all the students must become popular and there is no wonder if *Nālandā* was the most popular among all other sister institutions.

(1) See *Hwui Li*, o.c., p. 112.

India, of ancient times presents to us such a variety of students, totally different from each other not only in age but even in social status and attitude towards life, that it is hazardous to lay down one general definition of their aims and prospects. Students like Satyakāma Jābāla, fatherless and without a *gotra* realized *Brahma*, and in their turn, became teachers of others, for instance, Upakośala Kāmalāyana,¹ while kings like Ajātaśatru² and Aśvapati Kaikeya³ instructed such famous sages as Gārgya Bālāki and others. And to add to our wonder we are told that Indra resided for no less than 100 years with Brahmā to know the nature of the *Ātmā*.⁴ Statements such as these at once bewilder us. We are at a loss to know what the actual aim, in fact, the life of an average, ordinary student was.

Nevertheless, before we go to the Nālandā-students and their aims and prospects let us have some idea of the aims of the students referred to above, that is to say, let us begin with the Upaniṣadic times in our discussion of this subject.

The one aim of the student who repaired to the guru, whoever he may be—a Kṣatriya king or a Brāhmaṇa forest-recluse or a non-Dvija philosopher—was to acquire knowledge. But this knowledge as *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* tells us,⁵ was of two kinds, *Para* (higher), and *Apara* (lower, inferior); knowledge of the four *Vēdas*—*R̥g*, *Yajur*, *Sāma* and *Atharva*—*Vēdāṅgas*, *Śikṣā*, *Nirukta* and so forth was classed as Inferior.⁶ Realization of *Brahma*, of *Akṣara*,⁷ of the Immortal Self was the true knowledge. And this was the ideal that was put before by the parent before his son and by the teacher before a prospective student.⁸

(1) See *Chāndogya*, IV, 4.

(2) See *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*, II, 1.

(3) See *Chāndogya*, V, 11, 24.

(4) *Ibid.*, VIII, 7, 2, and 11, 3.

(5) I, verses 4 and 5; also *Śvetāśvatara*, V, I.

(6) Cf. Nārada to Sanatkumāra in *Chāndogya*, VII, 3.

(7) *Śvetāśvatara*, V, 1; also *Muṇḍaka*, I, 5.

(8) Cf. for instance Śvetaketu's case, *Chāndogya*, VI, and VII.

What was it,—whether the primitive condition of life, when plain living and high thinking was the rule, or the pessimistic outlook on life which saw danger everywhere and in all things except in the realization of *Brahma*¹—that made the student pitch his ideal so high that it almost became transcendental, we cannot say.

Coming to times less remote than the Vedic and Upaniṣadic, to the centuries when *Smṛtis* and *Dharma Sūtras* were composed, and when various philosophical systems were propounded, we notice that the conception of higher knowledge underwent a partial modification. Modification in the sense that doubts were raised² whether there was a soul, whether it was immortal, whether the realization of Soul was secondary and the problem of escaping from the chain of worldly miseries all-important. And in order to uphold one philosophy and to destroy the other, new ways and means were devised. Educational history of this period reveals nothing but the quest of men in search of means, by which they sought to wreck the doctrine of the heretic—as each one called his opponent. Nevertheless, the aim of acquiring knowledge, for realizing the Unknown, the Unmanifest, or the state of *Nirvāṇa* was still cherished. This quest of the Buddhist student for *Nirvāṇa*, etc., or of the non-Buddhist student for the Unknown may be compared with the desire of the Upaniṣadic student to know *Brahma* and may be classed as Higher knowledge.

It was with this aim that students of Nālandā as well as other non-Buddhist students pursued their studies. How many realized their ideals or how many thought that they had realized, we do not know. But the ideal, gradually, though not deliberately shifted, and was lost sight of and the means and its emoluments were given greater prominence.

(1) Cf. *Taittiriya*, II, 9, the expression: *ānandam brahmaṇo vidyāṇa bibheti kadācana*.

(2) I do not mean that doubts were not raised, say, in the Upaniṣadic or Vedic times, because even so far back as the *Rgveda* we meet with questions of the like nature. See, for instance, *Puruṣa Sūkta*, *Mandala* 10.

Before we go to the discussion of the emoluments, we have to qualify our preceding statement in two ways. First, it only applies to those students, Buddhist or non-Buddhist, whose main goal was the realization of the ideal. Secondly, in the case of majority of non-Buddhist students, who studied the *Vēdas*, etc. for a particular number of years—twenty-four or so—the question of emoluments did not arise. And of the many factors that were responsible for so simplifying the problem of livelihood, the caste-system was perhaps one. Vocations for Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas were almost predetermined.¹ Consequently, even though there was much in common in the education of these students with the Buddhists, paths for their future life were already chalked out for them when they finished their education and joined, once more, the worldly life.

Besides the social classification the custom that a son should follow his father's profession, was another factor which enabled the non-Buddhist student to pursue his studies with no utiitarian view.

Education, it would appear, had very little to do in securing professions for these students. To this extent the student in those days can be said to pursue knowledge for its own sake.

In Buddhism and Buddhist institutions there was no room for the Hindu social classification. Instead of the threefold or fourfold division of humanity into various compartments, we find that the whole of it was reduced to a harmonious unity, without any distinctions of caste and creed. The result was that the aim of all those students who had become *Bhikkhus*, (others may, afterwards, as I-Tsing says,² revert to the worldly-life and if they had not embraced Buddhism, to their respective castes and also their professions) was to achieve distinction in the Buddhist order. Offices such as that of a *Therā*, that is to

(1) See *Manusmṛti*, adhyāya I, verses 88-91. *S. B. E.*, XXV.

Cf. also *Śrī Mad Bhagavad Gitā*, adhyāya 18, verses 41 to 45.

(2) *Cf.* I-Tsing, o.c., p. 106.

say, the Head of *Bhikkhus* in the *saṅgha*, or when the Buddhist monasteries were transformed into Houses of Learning, the posts such as that of a professor, or Door-keepers of the University, who were eminent men,¹ or the abbot of the University, were greatly prized. As I-Tsing puts it, "Those white robed (laymen) who come to the residence of a priest and read chiefly Buddhist Scriptures with the intention that they may one day become tonsured and black-robed, are called 'children' (mānava)."² "To the great mass of students," says Rashdall, with reference to European students, "the University was simply the door to the Church: and the door to the Church, at that time meant the door to professional life."³ These words, though true to a great extent so far as the Buddhist students are concerned, need an explanation. Both the Indian and the European students looked to the Church to give them a profession, yet the profession of each vitally and materially differed from the other. The Buddhist *Bhikkhu*, who became, say, the head of the *saṅgha* or the abbot of the University in later times, derived no material gain. Honour and power were the only emoluments of his services, and of his high office. Unlike the European priest he was not given any pay or money in any form or shape. He dedicated himself to the cause of humanity, and to do this work, the only thing the *saṅgha* did was to provide him with all the necessities of life, suitable to his high post.⁴

The case of students who had not given themselves up to the service of humanity, but who still resorted to the Buddhist centres of learning to acquire knowledge and through it sought the profession they wished for, was different. Those who wanted to become government servants, not petty clerks, but those who hankered after higher ministerial posts in the Government, these, having received a degree in the

(1) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 171.

(2) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 105.

(3) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 696.

(4) See Hwui Li, o.c., p. 106; also I-Tsing, o.c., p. 30.

famous Universities like Nālandā and Valabhi, in the shape “of having been assured of the excellence of their opinion by wise men,”¹ and thus acquiring distinction proceeded to the king’s court to try the sharpness of their wit.² And the king followed a very strange and healthy procedure, a procedure which reminds us of the parliamentary elections in countries like England. Like the party seeking power and making all sorts of promises to the electorate, these fleshers from the Universities, seeking to be appointed in the practical government, presented their schemes and showed their political talent to the king and the assembly.³

Others who did not want to serve the government, but still expected a reward for their wonderful ability “made their debate in the House of Debate.” “They refuted the heretic doctrines of their opponents who became tongue-tied and acknowledged themselves undone.”⁴ I-Tsing tells us that these eminent debators received grants of land; while others were advanced to a high rank and as a further reward, their names were written on their lofty gates.⁵ To what does the word ‘their’ refer is not clear. Takakusu admits that his rendering is only hypothetical. We can, however, give our conjecture as to what ‘their’ stands for. Probably ‘their’ refers to the Universities. For just as learned men were appointed as Door-keepers in the Universities of Nālandā and Vikramaśilā, it is also possible that names of distinguished persons were written on the gates of the Universities. Another possibility is that ‘their’ stands for the ‘House of Debate.’ But here we are faced with a grammatical difficulty, because ‘their’ being plural cannot stand for the ‘House of Debate.’ Besides, we have not heard of any such custom, according to which, names of debators, who distinguished themselves in the controversy were affixed to the gates of the ‘House’, though there is nothing

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p 177.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 178.

strange in it, as it would be a very good encouragement to the prospective debators. We may, therefore, accept the former hypothesis that 'their' stands for the Universities.

I-Tsing dismisses the subject with the words "after this, they can follow whatever occupation they like."¹ This remark, perhaps, refers to those students who were not given some substantial reward such as grants of land but mere titles 'Pandita', etc., akin to our modern B.A. and M.A. degrees which would not immediately fetch any material value. Such students had to hunt for jobs. But then the task of securing a job was not so difficult as it is now. A pandit would easily get a post of a private tutor to a prince or the son of a noble. While, for those who were not Buddhists but merely had taken advantage of Buddhist institutions, which enabled them to get the best education, posts such as caste-system and hereditary professions offered, were open.

From the aforesaid remarks it would be clear that the ancient student was much better off than the modern, as far as job-hunting was concerned. And this for two reasons mainly. Firstly, the struggle for existence then was not so acute and severe as now. Secondly, the standard of living was much lower than at present, which also materially contributed to the happiness of the student.

The consideration of the aims and prospects of the students suggests another question. What was the value of the education which the Universities of Nālandā, Vikramaśilā and others in Central India and Valabhi on the Western coast, imparted? This question is beset with great many difficulties. We do not know whether we should consider the aim of students and its realization, or whether the means adopted for reaching the goal, or the various subjects and their intrinsic value.

The aim of the student, as we have seen in the preceding pages, was not, in the least, utilitarian. It was ideal or transcendental rather than practical. But it may be asked how

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 178.

many attained their ideal and in how many cases, the ideal was lost sight of and more and more attention was concentrated on the means and their immediate results *e.g.*, success in philosophical and religious discussions, which really were meant to lead to true knowledge.

The main point of this query, namely, the utility of discussions, may be looked at from different perspectives.

Leaving apart the question as to how many attained their ideal as being personal, depending on each individual's experience, the discussions and debates may appear as a constant and continual search after truth. They may be thought of as an index of the nation's mind, as religious, philosophical and averse to worldly pleasures. One thinking in such a strain will interpret the discussions as encouraging spiritualism. From a practical point of view, these very discussions will be regarded as those which "trained intellect, encouraged habits of laborious subtlety, heroic industry and intense application."

To the critic, however, who bases his opinion only on Hiuen Tsiang's statement, namely, that "from morning till evening they (the students of Nālandā) engage in discussions,"¹ or on that of I-Tsing that "there (in Nālandā and Valabhi) eminent and accomplished assemble in crowds and discuss possible and impossible doctrines,"² and to the critic who knows well the result of these discussions, the following demerits may appear: That the frequent debates were hardly in consonance with the facts of actual life; that very often, in these discussions, the ideal or desire for truth receded into the background; and that, on the contrary, it made the student dogmatic and disputatious. Thus, the education of this type he may characterise as Rashdall does³, while pointing out the defects of the Mediaeval European educational system, "as a melancholy record of misdirected energy, stupid routine, and narrow one sidedness."

(1) o.c., II, p. 170.

(2) o. c., p. 177.

(3) Rashdall, o.c., II, p. 705.

Likewise, as regards the subjects, Logic, Philosophy, and Theology, if we do not keep in mind the observation that "the value of education is largely independent of the subjects taught,"¹ but consider them together as interdependent then the merits as well as the defects of the subjects taught can be pointed out. Logic, Philosophy, and Theology seem to occupy a prominent place in the curriculum of the student. Hence, the University turned out or created a class of priests, philosophers and debators, while one special branch of Theology, namely Tāntrism, on account of its peculiar requirements, created a type of artists who gave us the Pāla Art, and also encouraged the development of provincial vernaculars.

But, from another perspective, Tāntrism would seem to be the cause of superstition, and belief in a number of gods and goddesses. Moreover, it will be regarded as the cause of the cultural and moral enervation of Buddhism and its learning.²

Yet another item of the education which until now escaped our attention is the method of teaching. As we have already seen, it was primarily tutorial. Consequently, the personality of the teacher wielded a great influence in building up the character and in developing the mental outlook of the student. This phase of Nālandā-education speaks much in favour of the University. For, what is our ideal to-day, namely, the reduction of big classes to small ones and individual attention over each student, was actually an accomplished fact at Nālandā. Daily attendance upon the teacher may be objected to on the ground that it took much time of the student, and that it curbed his independence. Looking from another point of view, the daily attendance can be looked upon as a practical training for life, cultivated as it did, the spirit of service and humility—virtues—which should be imbibed by all students.

Nālandā-education then had two sides, good and bad. And what thing here on this earth is without blemish? Considering

(1) *Ibid.*

(2) See Rajendralal Mitra and Benoytosh Bhattacharya on this point in the *I. H. Q.*, III, pp. 741-743.

the times in which the University flourished—when the greater portion of the world was still in intellectual darkness, when even in those countries, where the torch of knowledge was long-lit, discussions, debates, etc., were the outstanding characteristics, when the average man cared little for what took place around him—the work that Nālandā did, in creating an intellectual enthusiasm which magnetized the students of far and distant countries, such as Java, Sumatra, China, Japan, and made them undertake a weary and arduous journey to India to drink at her fountain of knowledge—that work with all its defects and weaknesses must be admitted to be really praiseworthy.

CHAPTER VIII

CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITIES

DURING the long period in which the Nālandā University flourished, many new Universities had arisen in different parts of India. A University, whose rise was perhaps contemporaneous with that of Nālandā, and whose fame also was not very inferior to it, was that of Valabhi. In every respect, it rivalled with Nālandā. Like the Imperial Guptas, who built Nālandā, the first building (convent) of the University was built by Duddā, the daughter of the sister of Dhruva I.¹ And even after its foundation, the University continued to enjoy the patronage of the rulers of Valabhi, in the shape of grants of villages for its maintenance, and buildings for its students. Again it was at Valabhi that the famous monastery called Śri Bappapāda was founded by Ācāryya Bhadanta Sthiramati². In a previous chapter we have seen that this Sthiramati had composed many treatises and was perhaps a pandit of Nālandā. Both the Chinese travellers found Valabhi in a flourishing condition. Hiuen Tsiang says, "There are some hundred *saṅghārāmas*, with about 6000 priests³," while, according to I-Tsing⁴, Valabhi was as great and famous as Nālandā, for, there were only two Universities to which the students in I-Tsing's time generally resorted to, to acquire the stamp of culture and refinement, after finishing their ordinary higher education.

Probably the same knowledge that was expected from a student who wanted to join the Nālandā University was expected from one joining Valabhi. I-Tsing compares Nālandā

(1) *A Grant of King Guhasena of Valabhi, Ind. Ant.*, IV, p. 174.

(2) *Ibid.*, VI, p. 9.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 266.

(4) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 177.

and Valabhi to Chinma, Shih-chu, Lungmen, and Chiue-li, all famous educational centres of China. Nālandā and Valabhi were, as it were, two store-houses of knowledge and wisdom. These were available to the persons who visited these Universities, but not without struggle which was often very severe. They had to show their skill in refuting doctrines, possible and impossible and many perhaps had to go away with down-cast heads, with their brains simmering and hearts rankling with intellectual humiliation. But those who emerged successful from this strife of words, became famous for their wisdom.¹

Valabhi, it appears, was to be a real rival of Nālandā. Geographically, if Nālandā was situated in Central India, Valabhi was situated far away on the Western coast. Culturally, Valabhi took pride in and championed the cause of Hīnayāna,² which Nālandā with its leanings towards Mahāyāna regarded its prime duty to defeat and destroy.³

We have nothing special to say of the studies of Valabhi, save that being a University devoted to the cause of Hīnayāna greater attention must have been directed towards the Hīnayāna works than towards those of other religions.

Excluding Sthiramati and Gunamati we have no knowledge of other pandits of Valabhi.

From Valabhi we pass on to another great University, namely, Vikramaśilā. Unlike Valabhi, this University was in every sense a sister University of Nālandā. As we shall see later on it also arose in Magadha, and that too very near Nālandā. Moreover, it championed Mahāyāna, and propagated the study of Tāntrism.

(1) I-Tsing, o.c., p. 177.

(2) It is not on the strength of Hiuen Tsiang's statement only who says, "Most of the priests study the Little Vehicle," that we call it a Hīnayānist University. The fact that not a single image of Buddha was found in the excavations carried out by Rev. Fr. Heras (in Oct. 1930) testifies that it must be a University of Hīnayānist who were not worshippers of Buddha like the Mahāyānist.

(3) Hwui Li, o.c., pp. 159-160.

The following tradition¹ narrates the rise of the University: Ācārya Kāmpāla, a learned professor of the school of Buddhist *Tantras* at Śri Nālandā, who had obtained the *siddhi* or perfection in the Mahāmudrā mysticism, was once struck with the features of a bluff, rocky hillock which stood on the bank of the Ganges. Observing its peculiar fitness for the site of a *vihāra* he remarked that under royal auspices it could be turned into a great place for the use of the *saṅgha*. By dint of foresight he also knew that at one time there on that hill a great *vihāra* would be built.

It is said that in course of time, Kāmpāla was born as Dharmapāla (Devapāla?), the renowned King of Magadha. He built the monastery of Vikramaśilā on that hill. The *Vihāra* became known by four names in the four quarters. In Tibet, it was famed under the name of Vikramaśilā. Owing, according to some writers, to the high moral character of its monks, and also because of its being the site, where a certain Yakṣa or genius of the name of Vikrama was suppressed, it was called Vikramaśilā.

Stripped of its legendary garb, one thing clearly emerges from the tradition that the University was founded by King Dharmapāla. To us, it appears that in order to satisfy the desire for antiquity, for mysticism, for something supernatural the true historical fact was given a supernatural appearance.

Scholars are not unanimous as to the identification of the site of the University. Cunningham's suggestion² that the modern village Śilās near Baragaon is the site of the University is rejected by Samaddar, as also the view of Vidyabhusana, who identified it with Sultānganj in Bhāgalpur district. "The best identification," says Samaddar,³ "is that by Nundo Lal De⁴ who identifies it with Pātharaghāta, a steep hill overhang-

(1) S. C. Das, *Indian Pandits in Tibet*, J. B. T. S., I, pp. 10-11.

(2) A. S. R., VIII, p. 75.

(3) *Glories of Magadha*, p. 157.

(4) J. A. S. B., V, 1, p. 7.

ing the Ganges. The hill is about six miles to the north of Colgong, twenty-four miles to the east of Bhāgalpur and twenty-eight to the east of Champānagar.” The identification fulfils the description of the Tibetan accounts of the place. So this is generally accepted as the correct identification of the Vikramaśilā University. Banerji-Sastri rejects the identification of De. He says that except that the hill is mentioned in the Tibetan accounts, the place in no other way answers the description of the Tibetans. He suggests Keur—a place three miles south-east from Hulasganj and just behind the south-west corner of Hilsa police-station—as a plausible and proper site of Vikramaśilā. For, he says, “Keur is in direct line with Nālandā and Odantapuri and within 15 miles of Nālandā, and with its close similarity with Nālandā remains, amply satisfies every known detail of Vikramaśilā.”¹

Like Nālandā, it grew up under the royal patronage. Dharmapāla furnished it with four establishments, each consisting of 27 monks, belonging to the four principal sects. He also endowed it with rich grants, fixing regular allowances for the maintenance of priests and students. Provision was also made for temporary students.² Other Pāla Kings, besides Dharmapāla, must have endowed the University with various gifts. Nayapāla, we know for certain, showed a keen interest in the administration of the University, for Dīpāñkara Śrījñāna or Atīśa accepted the post of High Priest at Vikramaśilā during his reign.³

So far as the construction of the buildings and their decorations are concerned we have got, though meagre, very interesting account.

There was a central hall called the House of Science. It had six gates which opened on its six colleges. And the dimen-

(1) *J. B. O. R. S.*, XV, p. 276.

(2) See S. C. Das, *Indian Pandits in Tibet*, *J. B. T. S.*, I, pp. 1-10.

(3) *Ibid.*, *Life of Atīśa*, *Dīpāñkara Śrī Jñāna*, *Ibid.*, pp. 46-53.

Note: It is doubtful who the king actually was, whether Mahīpāla or Nayapāla. For at another place, *Ibid.*, p. 10, we are told that “when Atīśa was appointed High Priest by King Mahīpāla.....” etc.

sions of each college (i.e. *saṅghārāma*) could be gauged from the fact that each college could contain one hundred and eight professors.

And these various buildings were encircled by a wall, which was not merely a construction of brick and mortar but a source of inspiration to all the prospective students. For, on its front wall, on the right of the principal entrance, was painted the likeness of Nāgārjuna, once the head of the University, and on the left, the portrait of Atiśa himself, who figured at Vikramaśilā.¹

In point of studies, that is, so far as the subjects taught are concerned, Vikramaśilā perhaps imparted education in the same subjects, such as Theology, Philosophy, Logic, etc., like Nālandā. But one subject that stands out more prominently than all others was *Tantra*. It was this that appealed to the students most, and hence we find numerous books written on it by the pandits of Vikramaśilā.

As at Nālandā, so at Vikramaśilā, the students who wanted to join the University had to submit to a severe test before the Gate-keepers, who were learned pandits. But, at Vikramaśilā, there were six gates and consequently six eminent pandits presided over them. Ratnavajra, Ācārya Jetāri, Ratnakīrti, were some of the most distinguished of them. But the pandit who excelled all his compeers, whose name became famous all over India from Ceylon to Tibet was Dīpamkara Śrijñānā, more popularly known as Atiśa.

Dīpamkara was born in A. D. 980, in the royal family of Gaur at Vikramanipur in Bengala, a country lying to the east of Vajrasama (Gayā). Under the sage Jetāri, he studied the five kinds of minor sciences, and thereby paved his way to the study of philosophy and religion. He acquired proficiency in the three *pitakas* of the four classes of Hīnayāna, in the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, in the three *pitakas* of the Mahāyāna doctrine, in the high metaphysics of the Mādhyamika and

(1) S. C. Das, o.c., p. 11; also Samaddar, o.c., pp. 150-151.

Yogācāra schools and in the four classes of *Tantras*. Having acquired the reputation of being a great pandit, in the *Śāstras* of the *Tirthakas*, which he studied till his twenty-fifth year, he defeated a learned Brahmin in Logic. From Rahula Gupta he mastered the mysteries of esoteric Buddhism. At the age of thirty-one, he was ordained in the highest order of *Bhiksus* and was given the vows of Bodhisattva by Dharm Rakṣita.

He went to Suvarṇadvīpa, stayed there for 12 years and mastered the pure teachings of the Buddha from the High Priest. On his return to Magadha, he was unanimously declared the chief by the Buddhists and awarded the title of Dharmapāla or the hierarchy of Magadha. Nayapāla offered him the post of the High Priest of Vikramaśilā, which he accepted.

Atiśa took a prominent part in the treaty which Nayapāla made with King Karuya.

He was repeatedly invited to Tibet, by King Lha Lama of Tibet who wanted to purify the debased and enervated Tibetan Buddhism. Even though he was offered plenty of gold, twice he declined to go. With great persuasion of Sthavira Ratnākara, and entreaties of the Tibetan ambassador in the year 1038 A. D., he visited Tibet. He wrote many books on Mahāyāna, delivered lectures on it and thus revived the practice of pure Mahāyāna doctrine. Atiśa died at Nethang near Lhasa, at the age of seventy-three, in the year 1053 A.D. He is remembered with deep veneration 'all over high Asia' or wherever the Buddhism of Tibet prevails.¹

We have a most vivid and interesting description of Atiśa by the Tibetan envoy who came to India to take Atiśa to Tibet. He is describing a meeting of the monks and students, a "convocation," as Samaddar has called it. "When all the rows of seats were filled up," says the awestruck visitor, "there came Lord Atiśa, the Venerable of the Venerables, in all his glory, at whose sight, the eyes felt no satiety. His graceful appear-

(1) Das, *J. A. S. B.*, I, Part I, 1891, pp. 46-53.

ance and smiling face struck every one of the assembly. From his waist hung down a bundle of keys. The Indians, Nepalese and Tibetans, all looked at him and took him for a countryman of their own. There was brightness mixed with simplicity of expression on his face, which acted as a magic spell upon those who beheld him."¹

Any doubts that may be entertained about the historicity of Atiśa and his famous visit to Tibet, are now dispelled by the historical documents that have been obtained from Tibet by Mr. Francke. Among the documents are two inscriptions discovered in the Tabo monastery of Spiti. One of the inscriptions speaks of King Byang-chub-'od of Guge, the very ruler who invited Atiśa to Tibet. "The principal hall of the Tabo monastery," says the author of the article, "seems to have remained almost unchanged since the days of Atiśa....."² But the thing most important for our purpose is that the inscription contains names of the two most important lāmās of the period, *viz.*, Rinchen bzang-po and Atiśa, the latter being called Phul-byung in Tibetan. "The inscription further says that Rinchen bzang-po was made a 'light of wisdom' through the agency of Atiśa." "This is," says the author, "apparently a reference to the controversy between the two lāmās which ended with Rinchen bzang-po acknowledging Atiśa's superiority."³

From the subjects which Atiśa studied, it appears that even philosophies such as Vaiśeṣika, were still taught, even though *Tantra* was the most outstanding subjects of the time. Atiśa, in fact, besides Tāntrism, had mastered all the subjects which were found in the Nālandā curriculum.

Despite his versatility in all branches of knowledge, Atiśa wrote by far the greater number of books on *Tantra*. A mere perusal of their names makes a most instructive reading. They

(1) Das, *J. A. S. B.*, I, Part I, 1891, pp. 46-53.

(2) Francke, *Historical Documents from the Borders of Tibet*, *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1909-10, p. 108.

(3) *Ibid.*

reveal the fact that by the time of Atiśa, that is to say, 1000 A. D., Buddhists had incorporated almost all the gods of the Hindu pantheon, and that Avatokiteśvara, Tārā, etc., were not the only gods and goddesses that were worshipped.¹ Such works are:

1. *Ārya-hayagrīva-sādhana nāma.*
2. *Śri Mahākāla-bali nāma.*
3. *Kṛṣṇa-yamāri sādhana-nāma.*

There is one work on Mādhyamika philosophy, that is also attributed to Atiśa, viz., *Mādhyamikopadeśa nāma*.²

Though the accounts about Vikramaśilā are very few, still they acquaint us with the diverse aspects of the University. While narrating the life of Atiśa, we referred to the “convocation.” The undermentioned facts give us a glimpse of the administration of the University, and of an aspect of the life of the students.

Besides the six Gate-keepers, the professorial staff consisted of a hundred and eight professors. Like the senate or the academic council, of our modern Universities, there was a board of eminent professors, whose main function was to supervise and issue instructions to the various professors. This board, says Taranath, kept watch over the affairs of the University of Nālandā. This would imply that the new University had superseded the old, and that all the power had been vested in the board appointed for the new University. It is also suggestive of the fact that the presiding deity of both the Universities was the ruling Pala King, the first being Dharmapāla.

It is interesting to note how the University and the king honoured distinguished scholars. Learned expounders of Theology were called the “pillars” of the University,³ pro-

(1) Perhaps it is not correct to say that the Buddhists incorporated the gods of the Hindu pantheon. For there are scholars who hold that the Buddhists evolved their pantheon independently of any extraneous influence.

(2) Bose, o.c., pp. 73-79.

(3) Samaddar, o.c., p. 150.

bably because they were responsible for the religiousness and metaphysical uplift of the students, whose main ideal was to attain *Nirvāṇa* (for others and for themselves), while the king himself granted the title of 'Pandita' to the distinguished alumni of the University.¹

If nothing condemnatory could be found in the life of a Nālandā-student, there being no positive evidence, we get an insight into the Vikramaśilā-student-life from the following story told by Das.² There was in Vikramaśilā, a class of Tāntriks called by the name of Kīrṇsukha, who once brought much trouble on Atiśa. One Maitri, who belonged to that class, was charged with certain irregularities in matters of doctrine, ritual and other matters of a similar nature, on account of which something condemnatory was written on the wall at the entrance of the *Vihāra* by a monk called Śānti. On another occasion a quantity of wine was detected in the possession of Maitri, which he had kept secretly in his place, and which he was alleged to have brought for being given as a present to a Buddhist Yognī, whom he intended to consult on certain matters. The fact having been brought to the notice of the *saṅgha*, they expressed their indignation at his conduct and decided to expel him from the monastery, but Maitri was unwilling to abide by their decision. At this stage there arose a difference in the opinion of the members of the *saṅgha*, some taking his side, others opposing him vehemently. The majority of the monks insisted on his being turned out of the monastery. One of the monks observed: "If his stay in our midst does not affect me or you individually, it may injure others (less guarded)." So, at last his expulsion was decided upon. His offence being considered a serious one, he was not permitted to be expelled by the main entrance. He was sent across the wall of the monastery. Though Atiśa, as the head of the *saṅgha*, had acquiesced in their decision about Maitri, yet personally he entertained doubts about its propriety and equity.

(1) Vidyabhusana, *Indian Logic, Mediaeval School*, p. 79.

(2) *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*, pp. 11-12.

Accordingly, he consulted the goddess Tārā, his tutelary deity, offering his prayers to her, in the usual manner at night. The goddess, appearing in a dream, thrice said to him: "Son, it has not been good." He suddenly awoke and came out of his room, but did not find anybody. Again he prayed to the gods and Bodhisattvas, for further enlightenment on the subject. He heard a voice which said, "Maitri has been innocently accused of the offence. As he had acquired the true conception of the *Bodhi* (saintly) life, you have committed a serious sin in permitting his expulsion from the monastery." It was also said that in consequence of it, Atiśa was destined to be born a huge bird of Sumeru and that in making three rounds, round the peak of Sumeru, he would kill numerous beings. The only means by which he could get out of the difficulty was to go to the northern direction towards Tibet, to preach the Mahāyāna Dharma there.

Besides throwing very important light on the actual life of the student, the story has a significance from other points as well. First, we learn that if any action was to be taken, it could be taken only after consulting the whole community of monks. Thus, even so late as the tenth and eleventh centuries A. D., the Buddhist *saṅgha* had retained its characteristic government, which we called "Republican Church Government."

Secondly, we get conclusive evidence of the fact that wine was used, though secretly, in Buddhist monasteries. We also learn that Tāntrism of a higher order never brooked any violation of the rules of morality, and if any such thing was brought to the notice of the authorities, the defaulter was severely punished. Lastly, we see that the story is an example of Atiśa's high sense of duty and love for the truth. Feeling that he had not done a right thing in expelling the student, he prayed for divine guidance.

We have thus tried to give a brief, yet a comprehensive account of the University of Vikramaśilā.

The question of the end of Vikramaśilā has no separate existence. What we shall speak of Nālandā's end will apply *mutatis mutandis* to Vikramaśilā and other Universities of Magadha.

Other Universities that grew up during the reign of the Pālas were Odantapuri and Jāgaddala.

The rise of the former is attributed by Taranath¹ to Gopāla, the first king of the Pāla dynasty; we have, however, no other evidence to prove the existence of this University nor do we know anything about its studies and pandits.

Jāgaddala was founded by King Rāmpāla in the eleventh century, in the new capital of the Pālas, Rāmāvati, on the banks of the rivers Ganges and Karatoya in the country of Varendra, *i.e.*, Northern Bengal. Its actual site, however, has not been yet located.²

From the works composed by its pandits, Dānaśīla and others, Tāntrism of the most degraded type seems to have flourished there.³ The works deal with Piśāca, owls, nāgas (serpents), yakṣas, etc. and their *sādhanas*, revealing to what low depths and moral enervation the pandits had given themselves up, believing all the time, that they were doing the most praiseworthy act, *viz.*, composing works on the worship of objects whom they regarded as deities.

Of all the contemporary Universities, the only University worthy of standing in comparison with Nālandā was Vikramaśilā, with its magnificent buildings and eminent personalities, like Atīśa and Jetāri. But even this University did not reach that pinnacle of glory, which Nālandā acquired in the days of Vasubandhu, Diśināga, Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti. For, notwithstanding the fact that the University imparted knowledge in perhaps the same subjects that one could find in the Nālandā curriculum, still the time, when it came into existence went against it. Nālandā grew up, as we have seen,

(1) o.c., pp. 158 and 193.

(2) For a fuller description, see Bose, o.c., p. 143 ff.

(3) We here exclude the esoteric aspect of Tāntrism.

when the Indian thought had found its best expression. And though this would hold good in the case of Vikramaśilā as well, Vikramaśilā suffered from the deterioration which had come over Buddhism in the form of Tāntrism, Mantrayāna, Vajrayāna, etc. These *patois* of Buddhism contributed nothing to the propagation of culture.¹ They rather were, to a certain degree, responsible for the downfall of Buddhism. Naturally, therefore, a University which consumed such base stuff, would not create a very great impression. And, for the publicity it gained in Tibet and other countries, much of it was due to the low standard of religion, education and morality that prevailed there. Tibet, we are told, was in the hands of the most debased kinds of religious practitioners, so much so that its king sent for Atiśa, who was known for his great learning and reforming zeal. Buddhism in India as well as in Tibet was raised from its moral and intellectual downfall², though Tāntrism, perhaps in its purer aspects, was still the most favourite subject of study, as is revealed from the numerous works on Tāntrism by Atiśa himself.

(1) We here exclude the part played by Tāntrism in developing the Pāla Art.

(2) Cf. These words, "It was Atiśa who cleared the degenerate Buddhism of Tibet and restored it to its former purity and splendour." *J. A. S. B.*, 1891, p. 49.

CHAPTER IX

NĀLANDĀ—AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

FERGUSSON compared Nālandā with Monte Cassino, one of the greatest interprovincial Universities of Mediaeval Europe.¹ From the evidence that is at hand, we think, we can assign it a still loftier position, *viz.*, of an international University.

Streams of pilgrim-students wended their way to Nālandā in search of knowledge from China, Tibet and Korea.² In India itself the princes of Magadha³ in Central India, of Kashmere⁴ and sons of many lords and nobles came to study at Nālandā from such distant provinces as Kāñchipura⁵ (modern Conjeeveram) in the South, Puruṣapura⁶ (modern Peshawar) in the North and Samatata in the East.⁷ Moreover, it was at Nālandā that King Harṣa,⁸ the overlord of Northern and Central India and the King of Yavadvīpa (Java) and Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra), Mahārāja Bālaputradeva,⁹ built *vihāras* for students to prosecute their studies.

Among the pilgrims, who came from foreign countries, Hiuen Tsiang was perhaps the first to visit Nālandā, for Fa-hien does not seem to have visited it.

(1) Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 136.

(2) Beal, *J. R. A. S.*, XIII, N. S., p. 556.

(3) Prince Bālāditya, afterwards King Narasimhagupta, *see* Takakusu, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 44.

(4) Padmasambhava, *see* Waddell, o.c., p. 26. Not from Kashmere proper but from its North-West, *i.e.*, from the country about Ghazni.

(5) Dharmapāla, *see* Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 228.

(6) Āśāṅga and Vasubandhu, *see* Takakusu, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 35.

(7) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 110.

(8) *Ibid.*, p. 170.

(9) Nālandā Copper-plate of Devapāladeva, *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, p. 327.

Whatever Hiuen Tsiang and his famous successor I-Tsing had to say about Nālandā, has already been noted to a considerable extent in the preceding pages. Consequently, we shall confine ourselves here to that account of Nālandā which deals with the pilgrims' studies at Nālandā and the treatment that was accorded to them.

The University sent four men of distinguished position some seven *yojanas* in advance to receive Hiuen Tsiang. Refreshing himself at the guest-house belonging to the University, Hiuen Tsiang entered Nālandā, with some two hundred priests and about a thousand lay patrons, recounting his praises, and carrying standards, umbrellas, flowers and perfumes.¹

The authorities at Nālandā had issued instructions to the servants that every comfort and convenience should be given to the pilgrim from China so that he might feel at home, and that all the commodities used by priests and all appliances of religion were for his convenience.²

The biographer has given a graphic description of his (Hiuen Tsiang's) life at Nālandā. After the pilgrim was relieved of the fatigue of the journey, he was taken to Śīlabhadra, the head of the University. To him, Hiuen Tsiang disclosed his object in coming to the University, *viz.*, to learn the principles of *Yogaśāstra* from Śīlabhadra himself, and then requested him to receive him (Hiuen Tsiang) as a pupil. The request being granted, he was taken to the college of Bālāditya-rājā (Narasimhagupta) and took his residence in the dwelling of Buddhabhadra, having four storeys (or, *the fourth storey*), who entertained him for seven days. After this, he went to reside in the dwelling to the north of the abode of Dharmapāla, where he was provided with every sort of charitable offering. Each day, he received 120 *Jambiras*, 20 *Pinbong-tseu* (*phūga*, areca nut), 20 *tau kau* (nutmegs), an ounce of *camphor* and a *ching* (peek) of Mahāśāli rice. "This rice," says Hwui Li, "is as large as

(1) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 106.

(2) *Ibid.*

the black bean, and when cooked is aromatic and shining, like no other rice at all. It grows only in Magadha, and nowhere else. It is offered only to the king or to religious persons of great distinction, and hence the name Mahāśāli (rice offered to the great householder).

Every month, he was presented with three measures of oil and a daily supply of butter and other things, according to his need.

A pure brother (*Upāsaka*) and a Brahman, relieved from all religious duties, accompanied him, with a riding elephant.”¹

Such hospitality was not bestowed upon Hiuen Tsiang alone. “In the Nālandā convent,” continues the same author, “the abbot entertains a myriad priests after this fashion, for besides the Master of the Law (Hiuen Tsiang), there were men from every quarter; and where in all their wanderings have they met such courteous treatment as this?”²

After paying a visit to all the sacred places and having paid his reverence to them, the pilgrim-student returned to Nālandā and took seriously to his studies.

The Master of the Law, as our student was called, heard the explanation of the *Yoga-śāstra*, three times; the *Nyāya Anusāra-śāstra*, once; the *Hin-hiang-tui fā-ming*, once; the *Hetuvidyā-śāstra* and the *Śabdavidyā* and the *tsah-liang-śāstras*, twice; the *Pranya-mūla-śāstra-tīkā*, and the *Śata-śāstra*, thrice; then he heard the explanation of *Kośa*, *Vibhāṣā* and the *Shat-padābhidharma*; finishing these, he devoted his attention to the non-Buddhist studies.³

The pilgrim inspired so much confidence and struck his tutor so much with his devotion, zeal and mental abilities, that we find Śīlabhadra deputing Hiuen Tsiang on his return visit to Nālandā, to expound, to the congregation, the *Mahāyāna-saṃparigraha-śāstra* and comments on the difficulties of the

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 110.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 121.

Vidyā-mātra-siddhi-śāstra.¹ But Hiuen Tsiang occupied a much more honourable post at Nālandā, than even the teacher and expounder of the above works. He attempted, in a work called *Hwui-Tsung*, to reconcile the two contradictory doctrines: *that there is nothing to be attained by effort*; and its opposite, *that we may attain the one true nature (by Yoga)*. The composition, when presented to Śilabhadra and to the assembly of eminent pandits was very highly spoken of and it was included in the curriculum for study.²

Rising thus higher and higher from one post of honour to another, the pilgrim reached the pinnacle of glory, when he defeated the heretic of the Shun-si (Lokāyata) sect, who came to debate with the monks of Nālandā. In this debate, Hiuen Tsiang not only showed complete mastery over the various schools of Buddhism, but a unique knowledge of the philosophical systems of others, *viz.*, the Bhūtas, Nirgranthas, the Kāpālikas, and the Jutikas, the Sāṃkhyas and the Vaiśeṣikas. We shall only refer to his refutation of the Sāṃkhya system, it being the most important of the group.

He first states the philosophy of the opponent, *viz.*, the Sāṃkhya. Says he: "As to the heretics called Sāṃkhyas, they establish twenty-five principles; from *prakṛti* or *mūla prakṛti* proceeds *mahat*; from *mahat* proceeds *ahamkāra*; from this proceeds the five subtle particles (called *tanmātrā*); from these proceed the five elements; from these the seven organs (of sense and action). These twenty-four, all minister to and cherish the Soul (*ātman*), which accepting and using the help thus given, excludes and removes itself. This being done, then the soul remains pure and uncontaminated."³

Thus showing that he was thoroughly conversant with the Sāṃkhya philosophy, he turns to its refutation. Addressing the

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 157.

(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 158. Very recently Yuanchwang's (Hiuen Tsiang's) *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi-śāstra*'s Sanskrit restoration is published in *J. B. O. R. S.*, XIX, December, 1933.

(3) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 162.

heretic he said, “ You say that in the presence of your twenty-five principles, the character of the Soul is distinct and diverse but by intermingling with the other twenty-four it becomes substantially and intimately one. And you say that Nature (*Prakṛti*) is hypnotised by union with the three *gunas* of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, and by intermingling of these three, is perfected the *mahat* and other twenty-three principles; thus you affirm that these twenty-three principles are perfected by the three *gunas*. But if you constrain your *mahat* and the others, to lay hold of the three and so to become perfect, as in case of a crowd or a forest and without this intermingling they are false,—how then do you say that ‘ all things are true?’ ”

“ Again, *mahat* and the rest, being each perfected by the three, then each one so perfected is the same as the whole; but if each is the same as the whole, then the office of each ought to be the same, and then, where is the force of the three forming the substance of all? Again, if one is the same as all, then the mouth and the eye functions, and so on, are the same as the functions of nature.

Again, if each function discharges the duties of all, then the mouth and the ear, and so on, ought to smell perfumes and colours; for if not, what is the meaning of the assertion that the three *gunas* make one common substance? How can any sensible man formulate such principles?

“ But again, *prakṛti* and *ātman*, both being eternal, ought to be in their hypostases identical; how, then, can one, in distinction from the other, by intermingling, produce *mahat*, and so on?

“ But again, with respect to the nature of *ātman*, if it is eternal, then it is the same as *prakṛti*—but if they are the same, then what need of speaking of *ātman*?—and then the *ātman* is not able to accept the aid of the twenty-four principles, and there can be no possibility of establishing the different offices of “ *subject* ” and “ *object*. ”¹

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. 163-164.

Hiuen Tsiang's refutation of the *Sāṃkhyā-śāstra* appears strikingly original and unique to us who are acquainted with that of Saṅkara, Rāmānuja or Vallabha.

It appears that Hiuen Tsiang probes the very vitals of the system; and the way in which he proves the futility of the *ātman*, by showing it to be identical with *prakṛti*, and incapable of intermingling with it, dazzles us at first sight.

But a little examination of his objections against the Sāṃkhyā would reveal that Hiuen Tsiang assumes too much. At least so it appears from the translation before us, and unless there is a mistake in the translation, or his biographer has not been able to represent his master's views well, we do not see any reason why the opponent should have been silenced and accepted defeat. We shall point out a few defects in Hiuen Tsiang's arguments. His objection that there is no force in the three forming the substance of the whole (all the principles) as each (as he proves) is the same as the whole, and thus the office of each ought to be the same, is thoroughly opposed to the chemical principles on which the Sāṃkhyā-system is based. Because, if our body is constituted by the five-elements, "perfected," as Hiuen Tsiang would put it, it does not mean that our body is as good as and equal to every one of the elements. Only when the five elements combine that the body can be created, and Hiuen Tsiang seems to have missed this point. Likewise, only the combination of the three *gunas* and a stir in their equilibrium can produce the *mahat*, and so *mahat* cannot be said to be equal to the three *gunas*.

Again, Hiuen Tsiang assumes too much, when he says that *prakṛti* and *ātman* both being eternal are identical (unless his opponent had said so, which is not reported). All things which are eternal are not identical; for they have some distinguishing characteristics and we know that *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* do possess such characteristics.

The foundations, therefore, on which Hiuen Tsiang builds his arguments are untenable, and so his refutation of the *Sāṃkhya*-system, though strikingly original, is unconvincing.

If the discussion is suggestive of the power of Hiuen Tsiang as a debator, it also suggests the capacity and greatness of the University which could convert a traveller into such a learned debator, who could talk on all the then known philosophies with so much accuracy. No wonder, then, if Hiuen Tsiang speaks about the University in such highly glowing terms which would make any institution proud.¹ And we think he was amply rewarded for the arduous and weary journey that he undertook for learning the *Yogaśāstra* and the like from the pandits of Nālandā.

In the interval that follows after the visit of Hiuen Tsiang in about 629 A. D. and the visit of I-Tsing in 671 A. D., that means in 40 years, according to I-Tsing, about 57 pilgrims visited India from China, Japan, Korea,² and we mention below names of those pilgrims who went to Nālandā for study. Those who came by sea, *via*, Tāmralipti are grouped under the caption “Pilgrims who came by the Southern route;” those by land, *via*, Mongolia, Turkastan and Tibet are grouped as “Pilgrims who came by the Northern route.”

We proceed with the pilgrims who visited Nālandā by the Northern route. The Shaman Yuan Chiu went to India through Tibet. He stayed at Jalandhara, where he studied the Sanskrit language, the Buddhist *Sūtras* and the *Vinaya*. Thereafter, he reached Nālandā, where he remained three years and made the acquaintance of a priest called Shin-Kwong. He also met here a noted priest of Ceylon, from whom, he received a copy of the *Yoga* and the sacred books. In 664 A. D., he paid a second visit to India and also to Nālandā, where I-Tsing was then residing.³

(1) We have already elsewhere referred to Nālandā's fame and so we do not repeat it here.

(2) I-Tsing, *Nan-hae-ki-kwei-niu-fā-ch'uen*, referred to by Beal, *J.R. A. S.*, XIII, N.S., p. 556.

(3) *Ibid.*, pp. 563-564.

Tao Hi, a Doctor of the Law, called Śrideva in Sanskrit, went to Nālandā, and studiously applied himself to the Great Vehicle. He left more than 400 Chinese *Sūtras* and *Sāstras* at Nālandā. I-Tsing did not meet him but saw his chamber.¹

In 638 A. D., perhaps immediately after Hiuen Tsiang returned to China, Āryavarma—a Corean—left Chaugan and came to Nālandā. Here he engaged himself in copying many *Sūtras* and became well versed in the *Vinaya* and the *Abhidhama*. He died at Nālandā at the age of about 70.²

Another Corean—Hwui Nieh—a Doctor of the Law, came to Nālandā in almost the same year as Āryavarma. Here he dwelt for a long time, re-adjusting and studying. I-Tsing, while arranging some Chinese books at Nālandā, saw under the title this record: “Whilst dwelling under the Tooth-brush Tree, the Corean priest Hwui Nieh wrote this record.” On inquiring at the temple, the priests said that he died there the same year at the age of about sixty. The Sanskrit works he wrote were preserved at Nālandā.³

Bodhidharma, a man of the Tukhāra country, of great bodily size and strength, first went to China and became a priest there. Afterwards, he went to India to adore the sacred vestiges. I-Tsing says that he met him at Nālandā. This pilgrim appears to be a globe-trotter, because from Nālandā, he again proceeded to Northern India and died at the age of fifty.⁴

Taou-sing, a Doctor of the Law, called in Sanskrit Candradeva, went to India in the year 649 A. D. When he visited Nālandā, he was much honoured by the King on account of his youth.⁵

The pilgrims who came to Nālandā by the Southern route:—

(1) *Ibid.*

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 565.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 566.

(5) *Ibid.*

A priest of the Mahāyāna School called Tang or “the lamp”, came to India by sea, landed at Tāmralipti, studied and perfected himself in Sanskrit and proceeded to Nālandā.¹

Another priest, Taou-Lin of King Chau, whose Sanskrit name was Śilaprabhā, also landed at Tāmralipti and then went to Nālandā. Here he studied *Koṣa*. After a year or two, he proceeded to Vulture Peak.²

Hwui-Ta, a priest of Kung chow, also came to India after visiting Malaya, etc., *via*, Tāmralipti. He says that Nālandā was some 60 stages from this place. He stayed at Nālandā for ten years.³

The priest Wou King studied at Nālandā, *Yoga*, *Koṣa* and other works, and died at Nālandā.⁴

We have spoken of and described the land route from China. The sea route to India from China was by way of Java, Sumatra, the Straits of Malacca, the coast of Burma and Arakan, to Tāmralipti on the Eastern Coast of India. Here the voyage ended and the traveller then proceeded on foot to various holy places. Some adventurous travellers preferred the route of Ceylon from Quedah.

How many more pilgrims must have come to Nālandā may well be imagined from the names mentioned above. These are the names of students whom I-Tsing had the opportunity to know. There must be many more, for whom no records are available to us.

I-Tsing, a pilgrim as famous as Hiuen Tsiang, also belongs to the group of travellers who came to India and Nālandā by the Southern route. From China he started for India, in A. D. 671 and arrived at Tāmralipti, at the mouth of the Hooghly, in A. D. 673.⁵

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. 558-559.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 561.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 562.

(5) I-Tsing, o.c., p. XVIII.

At Nālandā he stayed for ten years, and we have noted elsewhere his minute observation of the customs and manners of the priests and the life of students. "I lived in the Nālandā *Vihāra*", says he, "for ten years."¹ No mention is made about his studies at Nālandā; but we know that, besides collecting some 400 Sanskrit texts, amounting to 500,000 *ślokas*, I-Tsing translated the hymn of 150 verses composed by Mātriketa, in praise of Buddha when he was staying in the Nālandā monastery (A. D. 675-685). It is called *Sārdhaśataka-Buddhapraśaṁsāgāthā*.² The reasons for translating this hymn are given by him. "The author (Mātriketa) treats generally of the Six *Pāramitās*, and expounds all the excellent qualities of the Buddha, the World-honoured One. These charming compositions are equal in beauty to the heavenly flowers, and the high principles which they contain rival in dignity the lofty peaks of a mountain. Consequently in India all who compose hymns imitate his style, considering him the father of literature. Even men, like the Bodhisattvas Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu, admired him greatly."

"Throughout India, every one who becomes a monk is taught Mātriketa's two hymns, as soon as he can recite the five and ten precepts.

"This course is adopted by both the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna schools; there are six reasons for this. Firstly, these hymns enable us to know the Buddha's great and profound virtues. Secondly, they show us how to compose verses. Thirdly, they ensure purity of language. Fourthly, the chest is expanded in singing them. Fifthly, the nervousness in assembly is overcome by reciting them. Sixthly, by their use, life is prolonged, free from disease. After one is able to recite them, one proceeds to learn other *Sūtras*. But these beautiful literary productions have not as yet been brought to China."³

(1) *Ibid.*, p. XXXIII.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 156, n. 3.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 157-158.

The University continued to flourish for five centuries more after the visit of I-Tsing. During that long period, many other pilgrim-students must have gone to Nālandā in search of knowledge, hearing of its greatness from Hiuen Tsiang, I-Tsing and others. Unfortunately, we have no record of these visitors. We know of one student, son of a minister of Tibet, who came to India and studied at Nālandā. The circumstances under which he visited India are given below.

“The King of Tibet, Srong-tsan was very anxious to introduce art of writing into Tibet. He sent several young men to India but they returned back on account of difficulties on the way. Thereafter, Thonmi, the son of Anul, a brave, talented minister of the king, undertook to visit India for the purpose of studying the Indian Languages. The king furnished him with a large quantity of gold, to enable him to make presents to the Indian princes and professors of Sanskrit learning. He travelled southward to India and hearing of the fame of a Brāhmaṇ, named Lipidatta, noted for proficiency in the art of writing, he went to him. Under Lipidatta, his intelligence developed and the lamp of knowledge being lighted he learnt the sections of Nāgari and Gāthā characters. Having finished his education under Lipidatta, he proceeded to the great monastery of Śri Nālandā and having placed himself under the tuition of Āchārya Devavid Sīrīha, he studied the sacred literature of the Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists.

While Thonmi Sambhata was studying at Nālandā, the great Chinese pilgrim traveller, Hiuen Tsiang, visited the monastery. The splendour and usefulness of that institution, increased in the first century B. C. by Saraha, the tutor and spiritual guide of Nāgārjuna, were still undiminished.”¹

The work of the University was not confined to the teaching of students who were within its precincts. It sent out scholars to China, Corea, Japan, and Ceylon to light the lamp of knowledge in these foreign lands. Spade-work in this

(1) Das, *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*, pp. 47-48.

direction was already done by such luminaries as Kumārājīva, Guṇavarman, Paramārtha, the translator of the life of Vasubandhu,¹ in the early years of the fifth century, just before the time when Nālandā was developing into a University. After these, some fifty monks, majority of them from Central India, went to China and though the records at our disposal do not say that they were from Nālandā, it would not be wrong to say that many of them must have been from Nālandā. We know for certain that in the beginning of the eighth century, Subhākara Simha,² a pandit of the Nālandā University proceeded to China. Four works are ascribed to him in the present collection of *Tripiṭaka*, as his translations from Sanskrit into the Chinese. We mention two of his translated works:

- (1) *Susiddhikara mahā-tantra.*
- (2) *Subāhu-Kumāra Sūtra.*

Political conditions in China made it unsafe for the Indian pandits to go to that country. Very few pandits had, therefore, proceeded to China in the 9th and 10th centuries. In the latter part of the 10th century, however, a great Indian pandit, Dharmadeva, from the Nālandā University visited China. He proved to be one of the most famous translators of the Song Dynasty (A. D. 960-1127). He was appointed a member of the Imperial Board for the translation of Indian Buddhist Texts. By the year 981 A. D., he translated no less than 46 works into Chinese. In appreciation of the great services rendered by him in the propagation of Chinese Buddhism, the Emperor Theitsun conferred upon him the title of Kwhan Kiao-tash. Majority of the works translated by him consist of *Tantras* and *Dhāraṇīs*. To mention a few of them:

- (1) *Vasudhārā-dhāraṇī.*
- (2) *Mahā-dāṇḍa-dhāraṇī.*
- (3) *Buddha-hṛdaya-dhāraṇī.*

These names, however, are taken from the works translated by him, under the name of Fa-tien. He translated 72 new

(1) See Bose, *The Indian Teachers in China*, pp. 58-59.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 119.

works in 19 years (A.D. 982-1001) under his new name Fa-hien. Besides these, he translated the most popular work of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, *viz.*, *Sukhāvatīvyūha*. In order to encourage others to work like Dharmadeva, the Emperor bestowed another title of Hhuen Kiao shan, even though Dharmadeva was dead.¹

Perhaps the last pandit to visit China from Nālandā, was Pou-t'o-ki-to, who was described as the “Śramaṇa of the Temple of Nālandā of Central India.” He offered some relics of Buddha and Sanskrit Texts to the Emperor.²

We have not referred to the pandits who proceeded to China from Central India. But we think that these pandits from Central India must be no other than the pandits of Nālandā, because Nālandā was the greatest and the most flourishing Buddhist institution in Central India.

If Nālandā was an international University, it was the greatest University in India at that time and not only in Central India as Fergusson³ puts it. Says he, “What Cluny and Clairvaux were to France in the Middle Ages, Nālandā was to Central India.” To substantiate our statement we shall have to repeat some portions of the Chapter “Famous Pandits of Nālandā.”

From the earliest period of its history, Nālandā was the centre of attraction for students, and with the lapse of time, as its fame spread far and wide as a great Temple of Learning, not only students from different parts of India flocked to Nālandā for education but even kings of Kanauj and other parts of India, as well as kings of such distant countries as Java and Sumatra and Burma (Kāmarupa) began to show their interest in the institution.

We shall, therefore, turn our attention to these students and kings. The interest which Buddha and his band took in

(1) Bose, o.c., pp. 130-135.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 140.

(3) Fergusson, o.c., p. 137.

Nālandā, then a small but a rich village, we have noted in a previous chapter.¹

Perhaps the first student to go to Nālandā, from a province that was farthest from it, *viz.*, Kosala in Southern India, even before Nālandā had attained the position of a University, was Nāgārjuna.² He, probably, sowed the seeds of the foundation of the University.

Leaving, however, tradition behind, it appears for certain that Āsaṅga and Vasubandhu, both of them brothers, came to Nālandā from Peshawar (Puruṣapura) from the North. And here they found suitable soil for the cultivation of their genius, and contributed immensely to Buddhism, by expounding it and refuting the attacks against it.

The part which Dharmapāla and Śīlabhadra played in maintaining the lofty position that Nālandā possessed in India as well as abroad, we have already noticed. Now this Dharmapāla was a native of Kāñcipura (Beal identifies it with Conjeeveram),³ and he travelled all the way from this city, hundreds of miles away, to receive knowledge at Nālandā, in Magadha.

His successor, Śīlabhadra, who belonged to the family of the king of Samatata (in the East), wandered from place to place in India in search of religious truth. He called a halt only when he came to Nālandā because he thought that Nālandā's pandits would show him the way to truth and therefore to deliverance from the chain of miseries.⁴

Vīradeva, while King Devapāladeva was ruling over Magadha, came to Nālandā from Nagarahāra (a town in the immediate vicinity of Jalālābād).⁵ He did not go to Nālandā to study, for he had already mastered the *Vēdas* and other Śāstras.⁶ His object in going to Nālandā was, perhaps, to

(1) Chapter III, p. 36.

(2) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 97 and Taranath, o.c., p. 72.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 228, n. 118.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 110.

(5) Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, I, p. 43.

(6) *Ghosrawa Inscription, Ind. Ant.*, XVII, p. 311.

get his merit recognised. And he realised his ambition when “he was permanently appointed to govern Nālandā.”¹

We have already spoken of Nālandā as the home of most versatile pandits, whose assistance was sought by King Harṣa to vanquish the Hīnayānists. Reference was also made to the important position that Nālandā held in public, religious and philosophical controversies, so much so that 1000 pandits from Nālandā alone were summoned to attend the great assembly convened by Śri Harṣa, to discuss and examine the work composed by Hiuen Tsiang.

Nālandā's great fame attracted the attention of the king of such distant countries as Java and Sumatra. “With the mind attracted by the manifold excellences of Nālandā, he (Mahārāja Bālaputradeva, the King of Suvarṇadvīpa) built there (at Nālandā) a monastery which was the abode of the assembly of monks of various good qualities and was white with the series of stuccoed and lofty dwellings.”²

These lines speak volumes in favour of the greatness of Nālandā.

First, Nālandā was renowned not for one or two outstanding qualities, but they were, as the inscription says, “manifold”. Nālandā, again, as it appears from other lines, was a centre where “venerable *bhikṣus* assembled from the four quarters,” was an abode where “resided Bodhisattvas well-versed in *Tantras*, and the eight great holy personages,” was a storehouse of old manuscripts (Dharma Ratnas), to copy which learned men flocked to Nālandā, and finally it was an emporium which supplied medicine to the sick, alms to the beggar, garments to the naked, and shelter to the homeless. In Nālandā were thus combined all the diverse features. It was at once a monastery for the monks to reside, a University, and a library (which feature is really subsumed under the

(1) *Ibid.*, Lines, 11-12.

(2) *The Nālandā Copper-plate of Devapāladeva*, *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, p. 327, verse 32.

former), a hospital, and finally a free institution, catering to all the needs of the poor.

The second point worth noting, in the lines just quoted, is that Nālandā was even in the 9th century A.D., in the same flourishing condition, *i.e.*, a great centre of Buddhist lore that it was when Hiuen Tsiang and I-Tsing visited it.

We have thus shown that Nālandā was far greater than Monte Cassino, and held a more important position in India than Cluny and Clairvaux in France.

It was truly an international University. And what Buddhism did for religion, Nālandā did for learning. "Races belonging to different climates, habits and languages were drawn together, not in the clash of arms, not in the conflict of exploitation, but in harmony of life, in amity and peace."

CHAPTER X THE END OF NĀLANDĀ

LITTLE did the promulgator of the doctrine of Momentariness know that the very place, from which he preached his new philosophy, would also one day come to naught, and be destroyed, almost effaced from the memory of men whom it served so long, to find light, however again some day, as all things must, according to the Principle of the Wheel, in the hands of antiquarians. What he perhaps never dreamt of did happen. Nālandā, the resort of many religious teachers, the nursery of many new-fangled philosophies, the great Temple of Learning, after an existence of about a thousand years, was finally destroyed by the champion of a new faith. Its life was also momentary, for what is but a thousand years, in the infinite and endless flow of Time!

Thus did the great University meet its end, is the verdict of the political historian, whose main function seems to have been to record only wars and treaties, death and devastation of men and countries, and the rise and fall of institutions and empires. But strangely enough, the question is asked, why could not the buildings be reconstructed as after the Hūna invasion under Mihirakula and after the interregnum which followed the death of Harṣa and the rise of Pālas in Bengal, admitted though it be that the Moslem came, saw and conquered, and left no traces of the physical existence of the University?

The Moslem chronicler tells us that the onslaught of Bakhtiyār Khilji was so severe and so thorough that the monks (Brāhmaṇs with shaven heads) were killed, one and all, so much so, that there was no one left to explain the contents of books that the victor found at the place.¹

(1) See *Tabakat-I Nasiri*, Elliot, *History of India*, II, p. 306.

But this answer will not suffice, for we know from a Tibetan source, *Pag-sam-jonrang* that the temples and *vihāras* were repaired once again by a sage, named Mudita Bhadra.¹ Further, "after this, one Kukkutasiddha, a minister of some king of Magadha, erected a temple." Thus, there is evidence of the external regeneration of the monastic order. Yet this was short-lived, for, according to another tradition, the buildings were razed to the ground by a stupid act of two mendicants. Ridiculed by the young monks, they are said to have propitiated the Sun for twelve years, performed a sacrifice and alleged to have thrown living embers on the stately structures which reduced them to ashes.² Credibility of the account, we shall examine afterwards, along with the question of Nālandā's date of destruction at the hands of the Mohammedans. But, still the problem, *viz.*, why could not the University be rebuilt, monks reinstated and the whole institution given a new lease of life remains unsolved.

This step could have been taken, were it not for the fact that Buddhism as a religion and, in fact, the whole Buddhistic culture were robbed of all their vitality and mere external supports could not prop them up.

The history of the end of Nālandā, hence, is, in a sense, the history of the extinction of Buddhism from the land of its birth. Various causes contributed to bring about its downfall. Chief of them can be conveniently divided into those inherent and those extraneous.

Taking a rapid survey of the extraneous causes first, we find that Buddhism which had become a state religion in the Aśokan era, had, gradually, in the centuries that followed, lost the royal patronage.

Aśoka's son and successor was a devout Jain,³ and Puṣyamitra, the exterminator of the Mauryas, turned out to be the

(1) See Vidyabhusana, *Indian Logic Mediaeval School*, p. 149.

(2) *Pag-sam-jonrang*, Index I, i.

(3) We refer to Samprati. See Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, p. 186.

first persecutor of Gotama's faith.¹ In Kaniṣka's hands the religion once again became a state religion. But he never completely identified himself with the foreign faith. He appears to have clung to his old faith.² The Imperial Guptas, though they showed much interest, sympathy and toleration towards Buddhism, never embraced it. They, on the contrary, felt proud to style themselves as "*Parama Bhāgavatas*," devotees of Vāsudeva. After receiving a severe set back at the hands of Mihirakula, Buddhism seems to have attained its former glory in the reign of Harṣa. Nevertheless, Harṣa's patronage was analogous to that of Kaniṣka. The Buddhists never acquired its complete monopoly. Moreover, this patronage was enjoyed, whatever be its extent, for a short period only.

During the interregnum that followed Harṣa's disappearance from the political horizon, and the rise of the Pālas in Bengal, we do not know exactly what course the religion followed. But, when with the emergence of the Pālas from the political chaos in Bengal as her elected kings, the religion seemed to have found new champions, its internal degeneration had already set in, to which a death blow was given, by the mighty, blood-smeared hand of Islam.

The loss of Imperial grace was not the only cause. There were other reasons too for its disappearance. These were mainly internal; those which affected the system itself. Of these, its pessimistic outlook on life, conveyed by the famous phrases, such as *Sarvam Dukkham*, *Sarvam anityam*, *Sarvam anātmyam*, "All is suffering, all is impermanent, all is Non-Soul," and its deficiency in supplying a deity seem to be the primary and cardinal defects. In Chapter IV, while dealing with Tāntrism, we have already referred to the fact that the common mind found no consolation, on the contrary it felt

(1) Scholars are divided on this point. Raychaudhuri, o.c., p. 210 says that he was not so intolerant as some represent him to be, while Bagchi, *Decline of Buddhism in India and its Causes*, A.M.S.J., Vol., Orientalia, Part II, pp. 405-6, has tried to prove by citing *Divyāvadāna* and Kimura that Pusyamitra did really persecute the Buddhists.

(2) See Raychaudhuri, o.c., p. 254.

much aggrieved, when preachings were dinned into its ears from housetops that life is an unmixed evil and that *Nirvāṇa* or Salvation could not be achieved within a day, but only after the completion of a whole cycle of existences. The theory of *Nairātmya* or Non-Soul could hardly be imbibed even by the learned, when many other faiths preached against it so vehemently and when *Ātmavāda* (belief in Soul) appeared so natural to the human mind. The growth of divergent philosophies and views in Buddhism, since its inception, shows but one thing, namely, the eternal strivings of its exponents, to remove its shortcomings. To attract the literate as well as the illiterate, they tried many methods. And the outcome was the different and slightly divergent philosophies, *Śūnyavāda*, *Ālayavijñānavāda*, and others.

But when in spite of their efforts they could not draw in the masses and could not satisfy their thirst for the deity, Tāntrism was introduced. With Tāntrism, its offsprings, *Vajrayāna*, *Sahajayāna*, etc., made their appearance. But the authors, who thus quenched the thirst of the popular mind for a deity, for mysticism, for superstition, for the fearful and the grotesque, could not keep it under control. Horrible excesses in matters of ritual were committed, which sapped the strength, vigour and vitality of the entire system.

The consequence was that Buddhism, while trying to be democratic, lost its moral prestige among the intelligentsia.

From the seventh century, then, Buddhism was on its downward march. It was slowly decaying. Just at this moment when moral degeneration had taken its root into the system, there came a terrible, philosophical onslaught.

Kumārila in the eighth century and Śaṅkara in the ninth attacked and demolished the gigantic and at one time impregnable edifices of the Sarvāstivādins, Vijnānavādins and others. They showed and proved the hollowness and absurdity of the Buddhist dialectics, of the theory of momentariness, etc. And the strength and complete mastery of the Vedāntin

attack will be evident from the fact that Śaṅkara¹ thinks it too low, even to speak of *Śūnyavāda*, let apart its criticism and refutation.

We may just pause to consider the causes of Śaṅkara's signal victory and Buddhism's complete defeat.

The first great champion of Non-dualism seems to have played a masterly game in popularising his doctrine. Knowing, as he did, the different tenets so well, he soon discovered the weakness of the Buddhist system. Non-belief in Soul was, he knew, one of the Achilles' heels of Buddhism; so also the theory of *Śūnya* or Void. How to convert the mass of people who were ingrained with the doctrine, yet sceptic and tired of it, was the problem with him. He was really a genius and acted most ingeniously. He propounded once again the theory of *Ātmā*, and side by side preached that the world was all *Māyā*, illusion, false from esoteric viewpoint, but true from strictly exoteric view. He thus effected a compromise between the extreme Nihilism of Nāgārjuna, Idealism of Āśaṅga and the Realism of other Brāhmaṇic theories. And in support, like a clever and pious Jew, quoted scriptures—the *Upanisads*. Thus the literate as well as the illiterate found what they sought for. There was a personal god for the masses; and for the cultured few the improved edition of *Śūnya* as well as the reaffirmation, and reassertion of the theory of *Ātman*.

Buddhism was, thus, hemmed in from all sides political, moral and philosophical, and only one thing remained to exterminate it, *viz.*, the annihilation of its visible existence, its abodes, the Buddhist monasteries, where it still continued to flourish.

To accomplish this task, as it were, the Destroyer sent the Mohammedan adventurer, to which we have already made a general reference. In the graphic language of the chronicler, "Bakhtiyār Khilji went to the gate of the fort of Behār with

(1) Cf. Śaṅkara, *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*, adhyāya II, pāda II, sūtra 31. "Śūnyavādipakṣastu sarvapramāṇavipratiṣidhdha iti tannirākaraṇāya nādaraḥ kriyate."

only two hundred horses, and began the war by taking the enemy unawares." Continuing he says, "Muhammad Bakhtiyār with great vigour and audacity rushed in at the gate of the fort and gained possession of the place. Great plunder fell into the hands of the victors. Most of the inhabitants were Brāhmans with shaven heads. They were put to death. Large number of books were found there and when the Muhammadans saw them, they called for some persons to explain their contents, but all the men had been killed. It was discovered that the whole fort and city was a place of study. In the Hindī language, the word Behār means a college."¹

Needless to say, the description of the so called fort of Bihar refers to the capture and destruction of a Buddhist monastery. Now this monastery has been identified² with the monastery of Odantapuri, founded by Rāmapāla, on the strength of the remarks of Taranath. He observes, "In the country between the Ganges and the Jumna the Turuṣka king appeared and by means of several Bhikṣus who were his messengers, he with other small kings of the Turuṣkas living in Bengal and other parts of the country, invaded and he conquered the whole of Magadha, killed many clerics in Odandapura, destroyed this as well as Vikramaśilā and on the spot of the old *Vihāra* a fortress of the Turuṣkas was erected."³ Samaddar places this event in 1199 A.D. and generalizes: "This was the year of the destruction of all the Buddhistic places of learning in Bihar, Nālandā, Vikramaśilā and Odandapura."⁴

It would thus appear that there is no direct evidence to prove that Nālandā was destroyed by the Mohammedans in the year A.D. 1199. We, however, think that the description of the loot and ravage of the monastery referred to by the

(1) *Tabakat-I Nasiri*, Elliot, *History of India*, 11, p. 306.

(2) Samaddar, o. c., p. 162.

(3) Taranath, o.c., p. 56.

(4) Samaddar, o.c., p. 161.

Moslem chronicler might as well apply to Nālandā. The reasons for this suggestion are as under :

1. Nālandā like Vikramaśilā and Odantapuri, had, as we learn from Hiuen Tsiang, a big surrounding wall, which would give it the appearance of a fortress.
2. It had also a rich library containing countless books.
3. Moreover, its antiquity and huge establishment were sufficient reasons for the invader to regard it as very prosperous and therefore a good bait for attack.

Likewise, we would suggest the year A.D. 1205-1206, as the probable date of the *Vihāra*'s destruction. Samaddar gives two reasons for the year A.D. 1199.

1. Magadha (Bihar) was attacked after the eightieth regnal year of Lakṣmaṇa Sen. As Lakṣmaṇa era had its commencement in 1119, the date of the conquest falls in A.D. 1199.
2. The colophon of *Pañcakara* in the library of the University of Cambridge contains the fact that Odandapura was destroyed in the 38th regnal year of Govindapāladeva. As Govindapāladeva's accession dates from A.D. 1161, the date of the destruction of these monasteries comes to 1199 A.D.¹

Our reasons for placing the event in 1205 A.D. or 1206 A.D. are as under :

From the study of *Tabakāt-I Nasari*, we find (1) that Bakhtiyar went to Sultan Kutbuddin to pay him his respects after the conquest of Bihar. And Kutbuddin was made a Sultan after the death of Sultan Ghazi by Sultan Ghiyasuddin. And after becoming a Sultan, in 1205 A.D., he marched to Lahore, while Bakhtiyar seems to have visited him after Kutbuddin was well-established as a Sultan on the throne of Delhi. Secondly, we learn that Kutbuddin died in 607 H, i.e., 1210,² and the chronicler further tells us that he wore the

(1) Samaddar, o.c., p. 161.

(2) Elliot, o.c., p. 301.

crown for more than 4 years, that is, from about A.D. 1205, which exactly synchronises with his march upon Lahore in 1205 A.D. as a Sultan. Kutbuddin thus seems to have had the Sultanate in or about 1205 A.D.; and as Bakhtiyar Khilji was honoured by Kutbuddin as a Sultan, the invasion, therefore, of Bihar approximately took place in or about 1205 or 1206 A.D.

Hence Nālandā was destroyed by the Mohammedans in or about 1205 A.D.

The tradition cited from *Pag-sam-jonzang* about the final annihilation of Nālandā by fire may be true, for, while excavating the Nālandā-site, heaps of ashes and coals are unearthed, even on the topmost levels after the removal of layers of earth which cover up various sites.¹

But this regeneration was not and could not be effective. The Moslem sword had so much frightened the people and the damage done, material as well as cultural, was so great that even though the counter-blast in the shape of fire had not come, we doubt very much if the University would have once again attained its sublime height. Only one fact will suffice to convince the reader. We are told that all the monks were butchered and there was none left to decipher any book from the vast and unique library. Thus, even those monks, who survived the Moslem avalanche would never dare to enter the portals of their once beloved institution. They all must have fled and did actually fly away to the unknown and remote corners of India : while others to foreign lands “to find pastures new” for the propagation and transplantation of the remains of the Buddhistic culture.²

The Moslem invasion therefore appears to be the immediate cause of the destruction of Nālandā. Thus, did Nālandā

(1) See A.S.I. A.R., 1921-22, p. 20.

(2) Cf. Taranath, o.c., p. 94. He observes, “In Nālandā, much damage was done and the priests fled abroad.” While at another place, p. 264, he says, “When Magadha was conquered the scholars went out and spread the doctrine everywhere.”

which treasured the culture coming down from the times of Buddha, Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, Śāntarakṣita, Dīpaṃkara in its three storeyed libraries, and which for a thousand years diffused knowledge among Indians and spread it to the distant lands of Java, Sumatra, China and Japan, meet its end.

CHAPTER XI

NĀLANDĀ TO-DAY


IN the Chapter on "The Rise of Nālandā", we gave an account of the construction of the University by various kings. That account, however, so far as details of the buildings are concerned, was not sufficient. This Chapter, therefore, is intended, firstly, to give some idea of these details; secondly, to see if we can identify the various buildings referred to by Hiuen Tsiang in the plan of the University prepared in the light of the excavations.

Once a smiling city, shining with the light of hundreds of jewels, grand with its *chaityas*, towering turrets and *vihāras*, the abode of scholars and priests, Nālandā to-day is but a faint shadow of its past glory and splendour. Its present site is amidst long stretches of fields, interspersed here and there with mango-trees and huge mounds, at some places, each standing in splendid isolation from the other, and at others, several of them are found in such close proximity of each other as to suggest one continuous hill.

It was these mounds many of which are now unearthed and stand out as monasteries which, first, drew the attention of General Cunningham. He carried on some superficial excavations and from the finds that he discovered, he identified the site with the ancient seat of learning, Nālandā. But not content with a mere general identification, each mound, each temple, or relic was assigned its original name with the help of Hiuen Tsiang's account of the place.¹ The history of the rebuilding of Nālandā, thus, dates back to about 1861.

But the regular work of excavating the site was not undertaken until 1915, when the entire site was, first, mea-

(1) For a detailed description, see *A.S.R.*, 1861, I, p. 28.



MONASTERY No. 1 MAIN ENTRANCE NALANDA

night—Archaeological Survey of India)



sured. It extends, as described by the *Report*, some 1600 feet north-south, by some 800 feet east-west and comprises a long range of monasteries on the east side, and a corresponding range of *stūpas* on the west, with a couple of monasteries to bound the area on the south. Between the ranges of *stūpas* and monasteries to west and east runs the central approach avenue from the north.¹ The Nālandā of Mediaeval times, however, unquestionably extended far beyond the limits of the site so far acquired for excavation.

Now, for the sake of convenience and understanding the whole area has been divided and classified into various sites.

Of the many buildings (called monasteries) which are, to be precise, about eleven, that have been excavated, the monastery-site No. I seems to be the oldest. No less than 9 successive levels are visible.² And, within the course of about 8 centuries, it must have been built over at least 5 times.³ This is proved by the remains discovered at each new level. On the lowest level—the 9th—was found a brick-paving, a wall on the 8th, a *cabutrā* on the 7th, and quadrangles on the other four levels. The upper levels reveal very amusing as well as curious things. There is a stair-case, which leads us to the topmost level,⁴ the only remnant of which is a verandah running on the four sides. Originally this parlour must be forming a part of the *bhikṣuś* cells which can even now be traced from the existence of stone-coaches and niches, in the now open spaces immediately after the parlour.

The main use of the stair-case was perhaps to go to fetch water from a well on the stratum just below it. Besides this well, there is a very curious brick structure in the middle of the courtyard of this second monastery.⁵ In the *cabutrā* was found inset a couple of long duplicate panels carved in

(1) *A.S.I., A.R.*, 1925-26, p. 100.

(2) *Ibid.*, 1922-23, p. 104.

(3) *Ibid.*, 1919-20, p. 11.

(4) *See* pl. IX.

(5) For a fuller description *see A.S.I., A.R.*, 1916-17, Part I, p. 15.

basso-relievo with a representation of a bird-bodied human figures revering a lotus plant from the 6th or 7th century A.D.¹

One question that strikes us regarding this monastery is, whether it was a storeyed building. From Hiuen Tsiang's account it appears that Nālandā did have some buildings which had at least 3 to 4 storeys.² From various reasons given below we are inclined to think that not only monastery No. 1 was a storeyed building, but it was perhaps the highest of all other similar buildings. The reasons are: (1) the discovery of a well and wide dog-legged stair-case, which show a daily connection with the building beneath. (2) The thickness of the walls, which indicates that the walls were purposely made thick so as to build other storeys above them. (3) What we now call different levels of occupation at different periods were in fact various floors of the same building (we do not mean all the 9 levels) and occupied at the same time. The reason for so interpreting the various levels is that the nine levels otherwise presuppose as many destructions, which was never the case. The buildings were destroyed at the most thrice or four times and not as many as nine times. (4) Lastly, the discovery of a stone column-base in monastery No. 4 seems to be conclusive evidence of the existence of at least a second storey in this monastery.³ Hence monastery No. 1 also had storeys, and very likely the greatest number, as would appear from a series of levels.

Monastery No. 1 gives us a good idea of the rooms in which the *bhikṣus* stayed. As soon as we enter the monastery from the centre of the west wall, we first meet with a grand stair-case, 32 feet wide and projecting some 38 feet⁴. After this, comes the interior wall. Along this wall, on all

(1) See plate (VII a), *Ibid.*, 1921-22. p. 19.

(2) Cf. Hwui Li, o.c., p. 109, where we are told that Hiuen Tsiang went to the college of Bālāditya . . . having four storeys.

(3) For a detailed argument see *A.S.I., A.R.*, 1926-27, p. 133.

(4) See pl. IX.





the four sides, are rows of chambers, which vary very slightly in size but average some 10 feet square. These latter are each provided with two bed recesses, measuring 6' 9" in length, while two square niches appear in the square in the chambers at the north-west and south-east corners. And, in front of the chambers, there is a continuous walk or terrace.¹

It would be evident from the above that the ancient students, unlike the modern, had no separate bed-steads. Moreover, the rooms allotted to them were, comparatively, very small.

From the description of the students' rooms let us pass on to the general nature of the buildings, other than temples or *vihāras*.

The *saṅghārāmas* or monastic establishments at Nālandā all conform to a common type. They form a rectangle in a plane bounded by an outer range of cells or cubicles, with an open verandah, running round their inner face and enclosing a quadrangular court. Sometimes, the verandah is a colonnaded structure, and in other instances, partakes of the form of a terrace open to the sky. The exterior walls were apparently quite plain with the exception of a simple plinth moulding or string course dividing the facade and may or may not have contained windows. The light was obtained through the door-opening on to the inner verandah.²

We need not go through the details of other monastery buildings. It will suffice, if the more important aspects of each are referred to.

Next to the monastery No. I, is the monastery designated as I A. Something peculiar about this monastery is that in the centre are two parallel rows of hearths, seven in number, connected by a common dueit of corbel construction about 2 feet high. The same feature is found in the eastern verandah. Pandit Hiranand Sastri, who excavated it, thought that the

(1) The description has been given *mutatis mutandis* from *J.B.O.R.S.* IX, Part I, pp. 8-9.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

hearts might have been used for preparing, "rasas" or drugs, in which case, the building might have been a medical semi-nary or "*Bhiṣakṣālā*."¹

We, however, think that these hearts might as well have been used for cooking purposes, for in the two chambers on the east, were found heaps of decayed rice and oats. Hence, it is possible that the chambers were used as store-rooms, and these, naturally, would be very close to the kitchen. But these are mere suggestions, for, wonderfully enough, the rooms on the north of these so called "kitchen" and "store-rooms" yielded a number of stone and bronze Tāntric images. Therefore it is very hazardous to say for what the building was used.

Of the remaining monastery sites that have been excavated, No. 6 is important from this point of view that it is a large one measuring some 150 ft. by 120 ft. along the walls and the height to which these walls were refaced were about 8 ft. The photograph will give a very good idea of the whole building.²

As the excavations proceed, newer and newer sites become visible. So, as the *Report* says, "The range of monasteries thus revealed along the eastern boundary of Nālandā comprises ten buildings, and the northern limit of the area cuts across an eleventh monastery, as the range continues towards the Burgaon village."³


Amongst other interesting and important buildings that have been unearthed, those worth noting are *stūpa*-site No. 3, and the stone-temple and another structure at the northern extremity of the range of *stūpa* mounds, which was identified by General Cunningham with Bālāditya's temple.


Stūpa No. 3 forms the southern end of the western *stūpa* range and it is on the east of the monasteries No. I and I A. The main *stūpa* stands surrounded in the court by a large number of smaller *stūpas*, built one over the other on the same

(1) *J.B.O.R.S.* IX, Part I, p. 14.

(2) See pl. X.

(3) *A. S. I., A. R.*, 1926-27, p. 134.





spot.¹ And it has been now ascertained that no less than 7 *stūpas* were erected, one over the other. The builders never cared to demolish the old ones, but went on building one over the other. And this is not only a special feature of Nālandā *stūpas*, where this feature is repeated in the monastery buildings as well, but also of many other *stūpa* structures.

Other characteristics of this site are: the fine stair that has been disclosed, almost intact, leading to the topmost level, giving a beautiful view of the ancient lakes of the time of Mahāvīra and Buddha, the whole University area, and far off in the distance, the village of Burgaon.²

There are numerous votive *stūpas* all scattered about the main *stūpa*. Some of them are decorated with the stucco figures of Buddha and Avalokiteśvara etc. "One of these little votive *stūpas* is of unusual interest; attached to it, on the east face, is a little porch-like shrine containing fragments of a very *kacchā* stucco image, and this little shrine is roofed over with a perfect little barrel-vault in brick." Pre-Mohammedan certainly as it is, it is a beautiful example of a Hindu-vault of arch construction.³

It may be that this *stūpa* is the identical one referred to by Hiuen Tsiang thus: "To the south of this statue is a *stūpa*, in which are the remains of Buddha's hair and nails cut during three months. Those persons afflicted with children's complaints coming here and turning round religiously are mostly healed."⁴

The reasons for the suggestions are:

(1) See pl. XI.

(2) See pl. XI.

(3) See *A. S. I., A. R.*, 1926-27, p. 131.

(4) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 173. From the great height of the *stūpa*, the figure of Bodhisattva, etc., it appears that it is the same *stūpa* ascribed by I-Tsing to Bālāditya thus, "Northwards, 50 paces is a great *stūpa* even higher than the other; this was built by Bālāditya very much revered-in it is a figure of Buddha turning the wheel of the law." Beal, *J. R. A. S.*, XIII (N. S.), p. 572.

1. Even up to this day there stands a beautiful statue of a Bodhisattva.

2. Exposition of the lowest of this particular *stūpa* and storey, as the *Report* says, formed a terrace about the upper portion of the *stūpa* and served as a “*pradakṣīna*” way.¹

The mound at the extreme end of the *stūpa* range is not completely excavated yet. The work is still going on. Therefore, it is very difficult to say whether it is the temple of Bālāditya as identified by Cunningham.²

It however comprises a very large area. There are two or three courtyards on different levels of elevation, and within the courtyard there are small *stūpas* and images. But, as we already said, we must wait for more information to pronounce any definite judgment as to the site.

From this, we pass on to the stone-temple.

“The entrance to the temple was up a low flight of steps on the east. The centre of each facade is relieved by a slight projection; but, the feature of special interest here is a dado of 211 sculptured panels, over the exterior base moulding. These panels are symmetrically disposed around the facades, 20 appearing on each side of the main entrance and 19 in each of the three divisions of the remaining walls. The pilasters which separate the panels are decorated with the familiar pot-and-foliage design; and are surmounted by arches carved in trefoil shape, certain of them being of pointed form. Some of the panels have weathered away, while others seem to have been left unfinished. The dado of panels is surmounted by a double cornice, the lower moulding being relieved at intervals with replicas of the arched fronts of *chaityas* alternated by well-carved geese; and the upper, of which the greater part is missing, being decorated with larger replicas of the same *chaitya* motif; birds of various kinds posed in diverse ways appearing in the intervals, between them. In a few places, there are signs of a third cornice of greater prominence, in one case portraying

(1) *A. S. I. A. R.*, 1926-27, p. 128.

(2) *A. S. I.*, 1861.

a human head within an arch. This third cornice was, however, either never finished or subsequently ruined before the present brick walling here was erected. There is a pleasing variety of sculpture figured in the panels of the dado; human couples in amorous postures; representations of *Makaras*; scroll foliage and geometrical patterns; again, elaborately dressed women seated in pairs; *Kinnaras* playing on musical instruments; a snakecharmer, etc. The sculptures of deities include Śiva and Pārvatī in separate panels; or together in one, where the goddess turns aside in fear, on beholding the terrific form of her spouse; Kārtikeya with the peacock; Gaja-Lakṣmī; the gods Agni and Kuvera; the *Kachchhappa Jātaka* cleverly represented; and there are scenes depicting archery. In other panels, men and women appear in contorted attitudes, and a monstrous lion is depicted, its long neck towering over a smaller beast which has a curiously porcine look. 'Many are occupied,' says Dr. Spooner of these panels, 'with merely decorative devices some of which are of extreme beauty and fascination. One shows a design based upon the hexagon, which Sir John Marshall tells me, was supposed, like the pointed arch, to be exclusively of Moslem inspiration in this country; while others show a great variety of intricate and altogether charming geometrical designs. Perhaps the strangest are those panels, which represent apparently folding doors or gates, where one wing of the gate is shown to be closed, while the other half is rendered open by the simple device of not sculpturing it at all, but letting one-half of the figure within appear to view. One panel is entirely taken up with the heraldic mask so popular in Gupta art and in the art of later times, down to the coming of the Moslems. Another shows a human-headed bird with very flowery tail, the whole having a curiously Burmese look about it. A very heraldic pheasant sort of bird is strutting like any jackdaw of Rheims in another, swinging triumphantly an inverted *Vajra* in his beak.'

"The outside stone plinth having been cleared, Dr. Spooner came to some foundation stones, on which the

superstructure rests, and still lower down to what appeared to be a brick pavement a few feet wide, at the edge of which, a trench was dug down some 8 ft. From the evidence disclosed in this operation, it became clear that the stone-temple above was a much later structure erected over an older brick building; and as the panels of the plinth, according to Dr. Spooner, are assignable to about the sixth or seventh century A.D., it would appear that these materials were taken from an older building and utilized in the decoration of this temple, the level of which, in relation to the other strata, disclosed in the Nālandā area postulates a considerably later date for it. Dr. Spooner continues: 'The exquisite quality of the carvings shows that their date must have been not far distant from Imperial Gupta times'.

"The external dimensions of the temple are 118 ft. by 102 ft., but nothing definite can be said of the interior plan, until further clearance is carried out. The usual position of the sanctum is covered with debris of huge stones, and except two chambers, one on each side of the entrance, nothing can yet be made out. Fragments of the crowning *amalaka*, and various stone members used in the construction of the temple, are lying about the debris-covered remains."¹


Can this temple be the Brass-temple referred to by Hiuen Tsiang's biographer?² The reasons for this suggestion are:—(1) the structure built of stone could well bear the weight of brass-plates, (2) such a brass canopy would be a fitting finish to a temple which was so richly decorated with ornamentations, (3) the temple is just in the neighbourhood of the monastery which is perhaps the monastery built by Harṣa (the King of Central India).³ Lastly, the panels of the plinth, according to Spooner,⁴ are assignable to about the sixth or seventh century

(1) *J. B. O. R. S.*, IX, Pt. I, pp. 16-18.


(2) Hwui Li, o.c., p. 159.

(3) Hiuen Tsiang, o.c., II, p. 170.

(4) See *J. B. O. R. S.*, IX, Pt. I, p. 17.



NALANDA EXCAVATIONS.
DIAGRAMMATIC PLAN of SITE.



1953
H. K. K. K. K.
OFF. SUPERINTENDENT,
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
CENTRAL CIRCLE, PATNA.

A.D., which is exactly the time, when the temple was built by Harṣa.

The area of the University must have extended on its east to the village of Burgaon, as the whole village appears to be situated on a huge mound and numerous images of the Buddhist pantheon lie scattered about, in fields, under trees and on the roadside of the village. How far it spread on the west it is difficult to say, for there are numerous mounds very near monastery No. 1 and *Stūpa*-site No. 3, which still remain unearthened. This would still extend the area by half a mile or so. But, after these mounds, crossing the fields and at a distance of about a mile and a half, there is a huge statue of Buddha, a photograph of which appears on another page.¹ The statue, itself stands on a high mound, which is covered over by numerous remains of ancient pottery. This is suggestive of the fact that the mound contains under its womb remnants of some old building dating far back to Nālandā's times. The statue, also, must have been there from the time of its first inception, as its very size makes it almost immovable. Possibly, then, Nālandā of ancient times might have extended to this village also.

Let us now see if we can identify the *saṅghārāmas*, *vihāras* and *stūpas* attributed by Hiuen Tsiang to various kings in the plan of the excavations called hereafter "PE".

According to Hiuen Tsiang:

(1) Kumāragupta I built a *saṅghārāma* by the side of a tank on a lucky spot (o.c., II, p. 168). This *saṅghārāma* very probably is M.1B² of "PE" as it is situated by the side of the lakes, and very nearly to their south. And the *Stūpa* No. 3, which lies between the lakes and the monastery, seems to be there even before the building was constructed by Kumāragupta I. According to the *A. S. R.*, however, M. 1 appears to be the oldest.

(1) *See* Chap. VI, pl. II.

(2) *See* pl. XV.

(II) Skandagupta built a *saṅghārāma* to the south of the one above. (*Ibid.*) This *saṅghārāma* then will correspond with M. 1A of "PE."

(III) Puragupta built a *saṅghārāma* to the east of this. (*Ibid.*) This will correspond with M. 1 of "PE."

(IV) Nārasimhagupta built a *saṅghārāma* on the north-east side. (*Ibid.*) This can be identified with M. 5 of "PE."

(V) Kumāragupta II built another on the west. (*Ibid.*, p. 170.) This will correspond with M. 6 of "PE," though we said before that it was probably constructed by Harṣa.

(VI) Harṣa built another great *saṅghārāma* to the north of this. (*Ibid.*) The *Life of Hiuen Tsiang* says it was built by the side of the one built by Kumāragupta II. (p. 111.) M. 7 of "PE" perhaps is the one that was built by Harṣa, though the vastness of M. 6 and its proximity to "Temple 2" leads us to think that it was M. 6 and not M. 7 that was built by Harṣa.

Buildings other than *saṅghārāmas* are:

(1) A *vihāra* on the western side of the *saṅghārāma* and at no great distance from it. (o.c., II, p. 172.)

The big *stūpa* mound lying immediately to the west of M. 7 is probably the *vihāra* referred to by Hiuen Tsiang. The fact that "PE" calls it a *stūpa* mound need not deter us from identifying it with Hiuen Tsiang's *vihāra*, because it is not excavated yet, and the only reason for calling it a *stūpa* is that it falls in the line of *Stūpa* No. 3 and the one at the northern extremity.

(2) A small *stūpa* 100 paces or so to the south (*Ibid.*), probably of the above mentioned *vihāra*.

(3) A standing figure of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva on the southern side of the above. (*Ibid.*)

Even at present, though it is not shown in "PE", there stand a small *stūpa* and the figure which now lies close by the *Stūpa* No. 3.

(4) To the south of this statue a *stūpa* in which are the remains of Buddha's hair and nails. (*Ibid.*, p. 173). We think

that this *stūpa* is identical with *Stūpa* No. 3, firstly, because, it is almost to the south of the figure and again to its west lies the lake as described by Hiuen Tsiang. (*Ibid.*)

So far Hiuen Tsiang's account conforms well with the plan of the excavations.

But the following buildings present some difficulty in their identification.

“Next to the east” continues Hiuen Tsiang, “there is a great *vihāra* about 200 feet high.” It is hard to locate this. The unexcavated ruins to the east of M. 1 may contain within their womb the remnants of this huge *vihāra*.


Of the remaining buildings, the most important ones are:—The great *vihāra*, about 300 feet high, lying to the north of the *vihāra* which contained a figure of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva, built by Narasimhagupta (*Ibid.*), and the the *vihāra* of brass built by Harṣa.

The only building in “PE” with which any of these *vihāras* can be identified is the Stone-Temple, 2. We have previously identified it with the brass temple of Harṣa, and have adduced reasons for the same. Therefore we cannot identify it with the *vihāra* of Narasimhagupta.


Hiuen Tsiang seems to make a distinction between a “*saṅghārāma*” and a “*vihāra*”. This distinction is difficult to make out. We have taken “*vihāra*” to mean a “Temple” and a “*saṅghārāma*”, as it literally means, place where the *saṅgha*, the students, stayed, something like our present day college-hostel, with this difference that the former was much more than a hostel. In fact, a *saṅghārāma* stood for a hostel, a college and a chapel at the same time.

The wall referred to by Hiuen Tsiang remains until now a puzzle. We tried hard to find out its traces, but could not get any remains of it. The only way to explain its non-recovery appears to be this: that, in the time of the Pālas, the University outgrew itself and in order to make room for newer buildings the physical boundaries were broken down.

However, excavations are still proceeding. There yet remain some mounds in the south-west of monastery No. 1 and to the east of monastery No. 11 in "PE." Let us, therefore, hope that when these will be unearthed the remains of the extinct walls might become visible, besides throwing fresh light on the arrangement of the buildings.



BRONZE & GOLD FIGURES OF THE BUDDHIST PANTHEON
(FROM KURKIDAR, NEAR GAYA)



INDEX OF IMPORTANT CLASSICAL BOOKS

A

Abhicāra Karman, 122.
 Abhidharma Koṣa, 144.
 Ābhisaṃayālambikārakārikā, 19.
 Alambana-Pratyāya-Dhyāna Sastra-
 Vyākhyā, 108.
 Āryabuddha - Bhūmi - Vyākhyāna,
 111.
 Ārya - Hayagrīva - Sādhana Nāma,
 185.
 Aṣṭāśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, 59.
 Aṣṭatathāgata Stotra, 83.
 Avatārīsaka, 20.

B

Bauddha Gāna-O-Dohā, 115,
 Bhartṛi-Hari-sastra, 144.
 Bhikṣusūtra, 21.
 Bodhicaryāvātāra, 116, 117.
 Book of Dhātu, 143.
 Book on the Three Khilas, 143.
 Brahma-pramathana Yuktī - hetu-
 Siddhi, 22.
 Brahma Sūtras, 23
 Buddha-Hṛdaya-Dhāraṇī, 202.

C

Cullavagga, 26, 28, 29, 146, 154,
 155, 162, 165.
 Cūrṇi, 144.

D

Daśabhūmivibhāṣāśāstra, 18, 89 n. 1.
 Dvādaśanikāyaśāstra, 18.

F

First Principles, 105.

G

Gate to the Nectar,
 Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra, 150, 155.
 Guhyasamāja, 89 n., 91, 98.

H

Hevajrodbhava - Kurukullayāh-
 pañca-mahopadeśa, 83.
 Hwui-Tsung, 194.

J

Jātakamālā, 144.

K

Kachchappa Jātaka, 223.
 Kāraṇḍa vyūha, 89 n., 91.
 Kṛṣṇayamāri sādhana-nāma, 186.

L

Lakṣaṇābhidhānadhṛta Laghu Tan-
 tra Piṇḍārtha Vivarṇa Nāma, 107.
 Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, 18.

M

Mādhyamikārakā, 21.
 Mādhyamikamūla, 105.
 Mādhyamikāvacāra, 105.
 Mahādaṇḍa-Dhāraṇī, 202.
 Mahākārunika Stotra, 122.
 Mahāyānābhidharmasamyukta Sañ-
 gīti Sāstra, 69.
 Mahāyanasamāparigraha Śāstra, 19,
 193.
 Mahāyanasamāparigraha Vyākhyā,
 20.
 Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Upadeśa, 19.
 Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, 91, 92 n. 4, 235
 n. 3.
 Mahāvagga, 25, 28.
 Milindā Pañha, 21.
 Mūlamādhyamikakārikā, 18.

N

Nature of the Ratnatraya, 20.
 Nyāya-Anusāra-Śāstra, 193.
 Nyāyabindu, 75.
 Nyāyadvāra, 73.
 Nyāyadvāra - (Tarka) - Śāstra, 73,
 144.
 Nyāyapravēśa, 73.
 Nirvāṇa,
 Niyatāniyātavataramudrā-Sūtra, 70.

P

Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpā-
 mitārakārikā, 19.

P—*contd.*

Pag-sam-jonzang, 208.
 Pañcakara, 213.
 Paramārtha Saptati, 19.
 Pātimokkhā, 28, 152.
 Prajñapti-hetu-samgraha(?) Sāstra, 73.
 Prajñāpāramitā, 20, 93, 235.
 Pramāṇasamuccaya,
 Praṇyamūla-Sāstra-Tikā, 193.
 Peina, 144.

R

Rakṣācakra, 122.
 Ronki, 22.
 Rgvēda, 171 n. 2.

S

Śadaṅga Yoga, 107.
 Saddharma Puṇḍarīka, 20.
 Sādhana Mālā, 91.
 Sāṃkhya Saptati, 19.
 Saptadaśa Bhūmiśastra, 19.
 Saradhaśatka - Buddhapraśānsa Gatha, 200.
 Sarvalakṣaṇadhyana Sastra (Kari-ka), 73.
 Sarvatathāgata Pūrva-Praṇidhana Viśeṣa Vistara Sūtrantopadeśa, 83.
 Śastra on the Gate of the Cause, 73.
 Śastra on the Gate of the resembling Cause, 73.
 Śastra on the Grouped inferences, 73.
 Śastra on the meditation on the object, 73.
 Śata Sastra, 18, 22, 193.
 Śataśastra-Vaipulyavyakhya, 108.

Saundarananda Kavya, 88 n. 1.
 Siddha-Composition, 142.
 Sikṣa-Samuccaya, 70, 71, 115, 116.
 Siṁhanada Sadhana, 122.
 Sri Buddhakapāla Mahā Tantra
 Rāja Tīkā Abhaya Padhatināma, 107.
 Sri Mahākāla-Balli Nāma, 186.
 Subāhu Kumāra Sūtra, 202.
 Sudassana Jātaka, 38.
 Sukhāvativyūha, 89 n., 91, 203.
 Suraṅgama Sūtra, 78.
 Susiddhikara Mahā-Tantra, 202.
 Sūtra Kṛitaṅga, 36.
 Sūtra Samuccaya, 116.

T

Tarka Sāṣṭra, 23.
 Tattvasaṅgraha, 72, 78, 79, 83, 115, 118, 122.
 Tattvasiddhi, 83, 118.

V

Vādavidhi, 22 n. 1.
 Vajradhara - Sangīta - Bhagavata Stotra Tikā, 83.
 Vajravidāraṇīnāma Dhāraṇī Tikā, 83.
 Valitattva Saṅgraha, 108
 Vasudhārā-Dhāraṇī, 202.
 Vidyāmātra-siddhi-sāstra, 194.
 Vidyāmātra-siddhi-Sāstra-Vyākhyā, 109.
 Vigrahavyāvartanī, 18 n. 1, 21-22 n. 1.
 Vijñānamātra Siddhi, 20.
 Vijñāptimātra Siddhi Sāstra, 69.

Y

Yukti-Śastika-Kārikā, 21.

INDEX OF IMPORTANT PROPER NAMES

A

Abhyākara Gupta, pandit of Vikramaśilā, 124.
 Ajātaśatru, King of Magadha, 154.
 Akṣapāda, founder of Nyāya System, 13 n. 5.
 Akṣobhaya, 135; emanations of, 135, 137.
 Alexander, invasion of, 6, 164.
 Aparājītā, Tāntric image, 137; description of, 138, 139.
 Aristotle, syllogism of, 22.
 Āryadeva, exponent of Mādhyamika Philosophy, 18; author of, 18, 22, Nālandā and, 102.
 Āryavarma, a Corean student at Nālandā, 198.
 Āsaṅga, promulgator of Yogācāra, 19; pandit of Nālandā, 20, 75, 102, 104, 204; promulgator of Tantra, 91; Mātriketa and, 200.
 Āsvaghoṣa, on Nirvāṇa, 88; author of, 88 n. 1.
 Atīśa, otherwise known as Dīpamkara Srijñāna, abbot of Vikramaśilā, 31, 182, 184; figure at Vikramaśilā of, 183; life of, 183, 184; and Nayapāla, 194; visit to Tibet, 184, 190; death of 184; Tibetan envoy's description of, 184; 185; historicity of, 185; Tibetan inscriptions about, 185; Tibetan name of, 185; wrote on Tantra, 185; works of, 186; Maitri incident and, 187; character, 188; Tāntrism and, 190.

Avalon, on Tāntrism, 95, 99; on the aims of Tāntrics, 96, 99; on Tantra symbolism, 97.

Avalokiteśvara, cult of, 89, 95; image of, 133, 221, 226, 227, 234, 236.

B

Bakhtiyar Khilji, 208, 211, 214; attacked the fort of Bihar, 212.
 Bālāditya Narasimhagupta, Vasubandhu and, 19, 103; built saṅghārāmas and Vihāras at Nālandā, 45, 103; Narasimha-gupta, 49; ruled in, 51; restorer of Nālandā, 52, 55; stūpa and, 220, 221-222 n.
 Bālaputradeva, King of, 58; patronage of, 58; Nālandā and, 58, 191, 205.
 Balavarmman, ambassador of, 58: Nālandā and, 58.
 Banerji-Sastri, on the identification of Vikramaśilā, 181.
 Beal, quoted on, 35.
 Belvalkar, author of, 7 n. 1.
 Bhartṛihari, author of, 144.
 Bhattacharyya, on Vajrayāna, 98; on Tattvasaṅgraha, 83; on the origin of Tantra, 87; on Karuṇā doctrine, 89; on Tāntric Mantras, 93, 94; author of, 135; referred to, 137.
 Bimbisāra, 154.
 Bitpālo, artist of Magadha, 233; teacher of art at Nālandā, 235.
 Bosch, on the Nālandā bronzes, 234.
 Byang-chub-'od, King who invited Atīśa to Tibet, 185.
 Bodhidharma, a Tukhāra student at Nālandā, 198.
 Bodhisattva, cult of, 89; image of, 133; description of a peculiar type of, 133.
 Buddha, Vassā and, 25; on vihāra, 27, 28; Nālandā and, 34, 35, 36; image of, 131; description of the bronze figure of, 132; from Jagdiśpura, 132; on the relation of Bhikkhus and their preceptor,

B—*contd.*

154; attack on the life of, 155; on the dress of Bhikkhus, 157. Buddhagupta, built saṅghārāma at Nālandā, 45; identified with, 48; ruled in, 51. Buddhakīrti, pandit of Nālandā, 124. Budhagupta, seal of, 61n. Bose, on Sthiramati, 106; on the works of Sthiramati, 107.

C

Candrakīrti, pandit of Nālandā, 105; his works, 105. Candrogomin, pandit of Nālandā, 122; wrote on Tantra, 122; works, 122. Chatterji, on Pāla Art, 231. Coomaraswamy, on the classification of images, 132 n. 1. Coedes, on the rise of Tantrayāna at, 233. Cunningham, quoted on 34; on the identification of Tilaḍaka, 167; excavated Nālandā, 216, 222.

D

Dawsam Dup, on the classification of Vajrayāna, 93, n. Devadatta, 155.

Devapāla, metallic figures and, 57; Nālandā and, 57; inscription of, 58; king of Sumatra and, 58; patronage of, 59; Vīradeva and, 59, 123, 205; ruled in, 124; image prepared in the reign of, 138.

Dharmadeva, pandit of Nālandā, 202; translated Sanskrit works into Chinese, 202, 203; works, 202.

Dharmakīrti, contributed to Logic, 75, 77; work of, 75, 76; Tantra and, 91; Nālandā and, 112; Kumārila and, 112, 115; Śaṅkara and, 112, 113, 114; date of, 113.

Dharmapāla, views on Mahāyāna, 69; life of, 107; pandit of Nālandā, 108, 109, 204; his discussions with, 108; works of, 108, 144; lived in, 109, 204.

Dharmapāladeva, inscription of, 57; Nālandā and, 57; founder of the Vikramaśilā University, 181;

endowments to Vikramaśilā, 182; head of Nālandā and Vikramaśilā, 186; artists and, 233.

Dhīmān, artist of Magadha, 232; teacher of art at Nālandā, 235. Dhruva, on Diśnāga's contribution to Logic, 74, 75, 76.

Diśnāga, writer on Logic, 22, 78, lived in, 22 n., 4, 104, works of, 73; contribution to Logic, 73, 74, 76, 77; on Inference, 75; life of, 104; Nālandā and, 104; head-dress of, 157; China, Japan and, 104.

Dipamkara Śrijñāna, pandit of, 88, 215; High priest of, 182; life of, 183.

F

Fa-hien, quoted on, 38; mentioned, 39, on monasteries at Patna, 167. Fergusson, on Tilaḍaka, 167; on Nālandā, 191, 203.

G

Ganeśa, image of, 138, 138, 139. Gaṅgā, found at Nālandā, 138; description of, 138.

Gautama, on dress of students, 156; on gambling, 162.

Gopāla I, Nālandā and, 57; king of, 57; Odantapuri and, 189;

Gopāla II, 59; Banerji and, 59.

Gotama, founder of Nyāya-system, 15.

Govindapāladeva, last Pāla king, 60; Nālandā and, 60; died in, 60; ruled in, 61, 213.

Guṇamati, pandit of Nālandā, 105, 106; built monastery at, 106.

Gurjara—Pratihāra, kings, 61; Nālandā and, 61.

H

Hara, 139.

Hārīti, image of, 131, 134, 230; worshipped at, 134; I-Tsing on, 134; description of, 134;

Havell, on the observatory at Nālandā, 85; on the arched niches of Nālandā, 238; on the architectural and sculptural finds at Nālandā, 237.

Harṣa, of Kanauj, 50; king of Central India identified with, 50; built saṅghārāma at, 50; built vihāra at, 50 n. 3, 53; maintenance of Nālandā students and, 54; upholder of religious views of, 54, 209; letter to Śilabhadra of, 50, 54; Nālandā Mahāyāna and, 68; tribute to the pandits of Nālandā of, 125; Nālandā and, 191, 205, 207, 224, 225, 226.

Heras, on the identification of, 47, 50, 55.

Heruka, description of, 136, 139.

Hira Nand Shastri, on seals, 56 n., 61 n.; views on, 36, 56, 216, 220.

Hiuen Tsiang, quoted on, 33; on the saṅghārāmās at Nālandā, 41, 55, 216, 227; the soothsayer and, 42; on the building of saṅghārāmās at, 45; king of Central India and, 50; Purṇavarma and, 55; description of Nālandā by 63; on the curriculum at, 65; on the worship of images at, 133, 139; on students' qualifications, 142, 145; on the method of teaching at, 146; manuscripts and, 147; on Sthiramati, 105; Śilabhadra and, 112; on the morality of students at, 167; on the number of students at, 167; Tiladaka and, 167; on the discussions at, 176; on Valabhi, 179; at Nālandā, 191, 192, 193, 194, 197; studies of, 193; works of, 194; debate with, 194; the refutation of Sāṃkhya and, 194, 195, 196, 197; stūpa no. 3 and 220; stone-temple at Nālandā and biographer of, 224; plan of the excavation and, 225, 226, 227.

Hwui Li, on curriculum at Nālandā, 65; on astronomical observations at, 85; on the maintenance of students at, 160; on the number of students at Nālandā, 168.

Hwui Nieh, a Corean student at Nālandā, 198.

Hwui-Ta, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 199.

I

Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Sāṃkhya doctrine and, 19.

I-Tsing, on the character of monasteries, 32; on Śakrāditya, 46; on Nālandā, 46, on the examination at, 66; on Dharmakīrti's contribution to Logic, 75; on the worship of images at Nālandā, 131, 139; on the equipment of student before he entered Nālandā, 141, 143; on the fame of Nālandā students, 145; manuscripts and, 147; on the students entering Nālandā, 148; on students' discipline 150; on meals of students, 158; on students' subordination at Nālandā, 159, 160; on the morality of students, 160, 161; on the number of students at Nālandā, 168; on the aims and prospects of the students of Nālandā, 173, 175; on the discussions at, 176; on Valabhi, 179; Bhodidharma and, 198; at Nālandā, 199, 200; translation by, 200.

J

Jambhala, image of, 131, 136.

Jayadeva, pandit of Nālandā, 105, 109.

Jayaswal, on Kemper's book, 235 n.; on the school of art, 235.

Jetāri, pandit of Vikramaśīla, 183.

Julian, Emperor, on Education, 2n. 1.

K

Kamalaśīla, pandit of Nālandā, 72, 77; works, 72, 78; logician, 78; commentary by, 85; teacher of Tantra at, 84, 119; visited Tibet, 119, 120; discussions with, 120, 121; lived in, 122.

Kaṇāda, founder of Vaiśeṣika system, 15; lived in, 15.

Kaniṣka, 209.

Keay, quoted on, 31.

Keith, author of 7 n.; on Diinnāga's view of Inference, 75 n.

Kempers, author of, 132; referred to, 133; on Tārā, 133; on

K—*contd.*

Sarasvatī and Gaṅga, 138; on the bronzes of Nālandā, 233; on the relation of, 234.
 Kimura, quoted on, 47, 70; referred to, 103.
 Kotiśrī, image of, 137.
 Kṣitigarbha, a type of Bodhisattva, 133.
 Kukkutasiddha, built a temple at, 208.
 Kumāragupta I, identified with, 47; founder of Nālandā University, 47, 226; date of, 51; religious views of, 52; seal of, 61 n.
 Kumāragupta II, identified with, 49, 226.
 Kumārarāja, king of, 50; Harṣa's letter to, 50.
 Kutbuddin, 213, 214.

L

Lepa, inhabitant of, 36.
 Lha Lama, king of, 184.

M

Mahākāla, image of, 137.
 Mahindrapāladeva, 61; identified with, 61.
 Mahipāla I, 59; Atiśa and, 182 n, 3.
 Maitreya, 6, 74, 88; founder of, 18; author, 19.
 Maitreya (Future Buddha), image of, 133, 234.
 Maitri, student of Vikramaśilā, 187; Atiśa and, 187.
 Mālāda, minister of, 56; Nālandā and, 56.
 Mañjuśri, image of 133; Śāntideva and, 117.
 Mañjuvara, image of, 137.
 Marshall, on the finds at Nālandā, 139, 223.
 Mārīci, image of, 131; description of, 136.
 Mārīcīpicuvā, 137.
 Mātriketa, works of, 200; I-Tsing and, 200.
 Maukhāris, king of, 55.
 Mihiraku a, defeated by, 52; Nālandā and, 207; Buddhism and, 209.
 Mṛedita Bhadra, repaired the vihāras of, 208.

N

Naciketas, 3 n. 3.
 Nāgārjuna, 6, 53; founder of Mahāyāna, 16; author of, 18; on Śūnya, 88; definition of Nirvāṇa, 88 n.; Nālandā and, 102, 204, 210 215; figure at Vikramaśilā of 183.
 Nārada, 3; on education, 8.
 Narasimhagupta, Vasubandhu and, 19; identified with, 44, 51; restorer of, 52; defeated Mihirakula, 52, 57; seal of, 61 n.; built at, 45, 226, 227.
 Nayapāla, Vikramaśilā and, 182.
 Newman, on education, 2.
 Nundo Lal De, on the identification of Vikramaśilā, 181.

P

Padmasambhava, 118; life of, 119; Nālandā and, 118; Tibet and, 119; founder of Lamaism, 119.
 Page, on the gaming die found at, 165.
 Pālas, Nālandā and, 61, 228; kings, 57, 61, 231; Buddhism and, 209.
 Pāṇini, age of, 6; Sūtra-literature and, 6, 7; curriculum in the time of, 7.
 Patañjali, founder of, 13; age of, 13; of Mahābhāṣya, 13 n. 1; works, 144.
 Pārvatī, image of, 131, 139.
 Pātrakesari, criticism of Trairūpa theory, 77.
 Phul-byung, Tibetan name of Atiśa, 185.
 Pou-t'o-ki-to, pandit of Nālandā, 203; visited China, 203.
 Puragupta, identified with, 49; built at, 45, 226.
 Purṇavarma, Maukhāri king, 55; presented Nālandā with, 55.

R

Rahulabhadra, pandit of Nālandā, 102.
 Rāmānuja, propounder of, 23.
 Rāmapāla, Nālandā and, 60; Jāgad-dala and, 189.
 Randale, on the doctrine of Vyāpti, 75.

Rashdall, author of, 1 n. 1; on the meaning of, 1 n. 3; on Logic in Europe, 14; on the method of examination, 67; on amusements of European students, 173; on defects of Mediæval European education, 177.

S

Śakrāditya, founder of, 41; I-Tsing and, 46; identified with, 47; ruled in, 51.

Samaddar, quoted on, 37; identified with, 181; on the destruction of, 212, 213.

Samantabhadra, a type of Bodhisattva 113.

Śaṅkara, propounder of, 23, 83, 114; Dharmakirti, 112; Śāntarakṣita and, 114, 115; Buddhism and, 210, 211.

Śāntarakṣita, pandit of, 72, 75, 77, 215; works, 72, 78, 83; on Trairūpa theory, 77; logician, 78, 117; criticism of the Śāṅkhyā by, 80, 81, 82; style of, 84; different schools of thought and, 78, 79; Śāṅkara and, 114, 115; Kumārila and, 115; life, 117, 118; Tibet and, 118; lived in, 118.

Śāntideva, works, 70, 116; views on, 70; life, 115, 116; Nālandā and, 116; Mañjuśri and, 117; lived in, 117.

Sarasvatī, image of, 138; description of, 138, 139.

Satyakāma Jābāla, 4.

Sena, Nālandā and, 61.

Siddhasena Divākara, author of, 14; writer on Nyāya, 14.

Śilabhadra, abbot of Nālandā, 31, 54, 111, 112; Buddhism and, 70; life, 109, 110; work, 111, entered Nālandā, 110, 148; built monastery at, 110; Harṣa and, 111; Hiuen Tsiang and, 111; lived in, 112, 204.

Śiva, image of, 131, 138, 139.

Skandagupta, 47, 48, 226; identified with, 48.

Spooner, 223, 224.

Sthiramati, works, 69; views on, 69; pandit of, 105; founded

monastery at, 105, 106, 179; Tibet and, 105, 106; lived in, 106; works of, 107; Tantra and, 107.

Subhākara Śiṁha, pandit of Nālandā, 212; visited China, 202; translated into Chinese, 202.

Sureśvaravarman, seal, 55; genealogy of, 55.

Sūrya, image of, 131, 138.

Suviṣṇu, Nālandā and, 39.

T

Tang, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 199.

Taranath, author of, 20; quoted on, 37, 103; on Diñnāga, 104; on Jayadeva, 105, 109; on Candra-kirti, 105; on Dharmakirti, 112; on Nālandā and Vikramaśilā, 186; on Odantapuri, 189, 202; on art, 233; mentioned, 235.

Tārā, image of, 131; worshipped at, 134; description of, 134, 135; Mahā Śrī, 135; Śyāma, 135; Atiśa and, 188.

Tao Hi, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 198.

Taou Lin, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 199.

Taou-sing, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 198.

Tathāgatagupta, built saṅghārāma at, 45; identified with, 49.

Thonmi, Tibetan minister's son, 201; at Nālandā, 201.

Trailokyavijaya, 136; description of, 136, 139.

Tucci, 18; quoted on, 18; on Tantra, 95 n. 1.

V

Vāgiśwari, 59.

Vajra, king, built saṅghārāma at, 45; identified with, 49.

Vajrapāni, mentioned, 234; description of, 135, 137.

Vajraśāradā, image of, 137.

Vainyagupta, seal of, 61 n.

Vaiśāṁpāyana, 155.

Vallabha, 23.

Varmans, 55; seals of, 55.

Vārṣaganya, Śāṅkhyā and, 19.

V—*contd.*

Vasubandhu, mentioned, 6; author of, 19; lived in, 19 n. 5, 103; pandit of Nālandā, 20, 103, 104, 215; works on Logic, 23; syllogism of, 74, 75; Bālāditya, and, 103; Mātriketa on, 200. Vātsyāyana, author of, 19; Bhāṣya, 74, 75. Vidyābhūṣana, quoted on, 21; on the dress of Bhikkhus, 157, 158; on Vikramāśilā, 182. Vigrahapāla, 60. Vikramāditya I, identified with, 49. Vikramāditya II, identified with, 49. Vindhyaśā, 19. Virocana, 3 n. 3. Viradeva, Devapāla and, 59; head of the saṅgha, 59, 205; governor of Nālandā, 123, 205; life, 123, 124.

Viṣṇu, image of, 131, 138; description of, 139, 183.

W

Waddell, on Mahāyāna, 17; on Tantra, 91.

Walden, author of, 2 n. 1.

Winternitz, on Tantra, 86.

Wou King, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 199.

Y

Yājñavalkya, 155.

Yamāntaka, 137; description of, 137.

Yāska, author of, 7.

Yaśodharma, identified with, 56.

Yaśovarmadeva, inscription of, 56; Nālandā and, 56; identified with, 56; ruled at, 56.

Yuvan Chiu, a Chinese student at Nālandā, 197.

INDEX OF IMPORTANT PLACES

A

Aligarh, University and Theology, 2 n. 4.

B

Benares, University and Theology, 2 n. 4.

Bologna, University of, 5.

Burgaon, identified with, 221; village of, 225.

C

Cambodia, 233.

Ceylon, Nālandā and, 201.

China, 104, 191, 197, 200, 201, 202, 203, 215, 233.

Cluny, 203, 206.

Clair-Vaux, 203, 206.

E

Ellora, caves, 27; slabs of stone at, 147.

H

Harappā, drainage system of, 237.

J

Jāgaddala, University of, 168; rise of, 189; pandits of, 189.

Java, 58, 191; Maitreya-figure of, 234; Buddha-figure of, 234; Nālandā Art and, 233; Mahāyāna of, 235.

K

Kāmarupa, 203.

Kāñchīpura, 104, 107, 108, 204; Nālandā and, 191.

Kanheri, caves, 27.

Kārlā, Caitya cave at, 27.

M

Malay, Archipelago, Nālandā's influence over, 233; inscription at, 233.

Moheno-jo-daro, drainage system of, 237.

Monte Cassino, 191; Nālandā and, 191, 206.

N

Nala, birth-place of, 38.

Nālaka, birth-place of, 38.

Nālandā, application of the word, 'University' to, 1; and Theology, 2 n. 4; educational institutions at, 3; a *vihāra*, 4; professors, 5; period preceding the rise of, 5; heritage of, 6, 23, 229; wall at, 29, 53; old account of, 33; meaning of, 35; origin of the name of, 36 n. 2; Buddha and, 36; Suviṣṇu and, 39; University town and, 40; climate of, 41; prophecy about, 42; Mihirakula and, 43; royal patrons of, 44; I-Tsing on, 46; date of the royal rise of, 51-52; Tantra at, 86; Tāntrism and, 101; education, 101; Purṇavarma and, 55; Yaśovarmmañadeva and, 56; Devapāladeva and, 57, 58-59; Gopāla II, 59; Mahīpala I, 59, 60; Pālas and, 61; number of colleges at, 62; arrangement and description of buildings at, 62-63; library at, 63, 215; a scholastic city, 64; studies of, 65; curriculum at, 65, 67, 145; degree, 66, 174; method of examination at, 66, 147; two kinds of students at, 67; Theology and, 67; sky-flower doctrine, 68, 69; teachings, 78; not a Buddhist University only, 82; a Temple of Learning, 82; Astronomy at, 85; clepsydra at, 85; ritualism 94, 128, 131; changes in ritualism of, 140; and Tāntrism, 101; Art, 101, 139, 231, 232, 233, 234; education,

101; Pandita, 102; Vasubandhu, 103; Āśāṅga, 103; and Śilabhadra, 110, 111, 112; and Dharmakīrti, 112; and Śāntideva, 116; and Padmasāmbhava, 118, 119; and Candrogomin, 122; and Viradeva, 123; seal of, 123; in a flourishing condition, 124; and Buddhakīrti, 124; Pandits at, 124, 125, 126, 127; excavations at, 128, 229; the rites at, 128; Ablution of the Holy Image at, 129; Caityavandana at, 130; image discovered at, 131, 132; Buddha image, 132; Maitreya image, 133, 234; Bodhisattva image, 133, 134; Tārā and Hāritī worshipped at, 134; figure of Hāritī, 134; figure of Tārā, 134, 135; Bhṛukutī Tārā worshipped at, 135; figure of Vasudhārā, 135; figure of Trai-lokyavijaya, 136; figure of Heruka, 136; figure of Jambhala, 136; figure of Māricī, 136; figure of Yamāntaka, 137; figure of Vajrapāṇi, 134, 137, 230, 234; figure of Mañjuvara, 137; figure of Kotiśrī, 137; figure of Vajrasāradā, 137; figure of Aparājītā, 138; figures of Hindu pantheon at, 138; figure of Viṣṇu, 138; figure of Sarasvatī, 138; figure of Gaṅgā, 138; figure of Śiva and Pārvatī, 139, 223; University of Universities, 145; cf. with Oxford and Cambridge, 145; method of teaching at, 146, 147; copying of manuscripts at, 147; matriculation examination at, 147, 148; age of student entering, 148, 149; a school for secondary education, 149; state of discipline at, 149, 152n; dress of the professors of, 157; meals of the students of, 158; provisions of food to, 159; daily life of the students of, 141; entrance at, 144; gambling at, 164; the find of a gaming die at, 164; games and amusements of students of, 166; number of students at, 166, 168; number of students and, 169; aims and prospects of the students of, 170;

aims of the students of, 171; Door-keepers of the University of, 174; Value of the education of the University of, 175, 176; value of the discussions at, 176; storehouse of knowledge and wisdom, 180; supervised by Vikramāśilā, 186; end of, 189, 207, 208; date of destruction of, 208, 212, 213, 214; compared with Vikramāśilā, 189; compared with Monte Cassino, 191, 205; Ferguson and, 191; international students concourse at, 191; Hsien Tsiang at, 191, 192, 193; 197; Pilgrim-students by the Northern route at, 197, 198, 199; Pilgrim-students by the Southern route at, 199; I-Tsing at, 200; Thonmi at, 201; pandits to China, 202, 203; interprovincial University, 203; manifold aspects of 205; centre of Buddhist lore, 206; Cluny, Clairvaux and, 205; to-day, 216; Cunningham and, 216; rebuilding of, 216; of Medieval times, 217, 227; Monastery site I at, 217, 218; storeyed buildings at, 218; bhikṣus cells at, 218; saṅghārāmas at, 219; Monastery No. I at, 219; Monastery No. 6 at, 220; Stūpa site, 3, 220, 221, 235, 236; stone-Temple at, 222, 224; buildings, 229, 235, 237; Art and, 229; Bitpālō and, 235; Dhīmān and, 235; bronzes of, 233, 235; Malay Archipelago and, 233, 234; Mahāyāna of Java and, 234; Java Temples and, 234; standing Buddha of, 234; Maitreya of, 234; Stūpa-style at, 236; bricks, 236; flourished in, 237; drains, 237; architectural specimens, 237; school of arts and crafts at, 238.

O

Odantapuri, vihāra, 29; University of, 168, 213; rise of, 189; destroyed, 212.

Oxford, University and Theology, 2 n. 4; 146; meals of students of, 159.

P

Paris, University and Theology, 2 n. 4; University, 5, 155.
Puruṣapura, 103, 191.

S

Salerno, University of, 5.
Samatata, 110, 191, 204.
Sāñchi, stūpa at, 235.
Sāraṇāth, stūpa, 235; Dhāmekh, stūpa at, 236.
Suvarṇadvīpa, king of, 58.
Sumatra, 58, 203, 205, 215, 233.

T

Takṣaśilā. Theology and, 2 n. 4; schools of arts and crafts at, 237; subjects taught at, 9; number of students at, 167.
Talang Toewo, inscription at, 233, 234.
Tibet, Tāntrism and, 190; Atiśa and, 186, 190; Nālandā and, 191, 200; King of, 201.
Tilaḍaka, monastery at, 167.

V

Valabhi, University of, 145; Monastery at, 105, 106; Sthiramatī and 105, 106, 179; degree of, 173; value of the education of, 175; rise of, 179; compared with Nālandā, 179, 180; royal patrons of, 179; store-house of knowledge and wisdom, 180; studies of, 180.

Vikramaśilā, mentioned, 85, 102, 124, 145, 168; number of students at, 169; Door-keepers of, 174, 183; sister University of, 180; the rise of, 181; founder of, 181, the site of, 181, 182; royal patrons of, 182; Dharmapāla and, 182; Atiśa and, 182, 184; description of, 182; studies of, 183; figure of Nāgārjuna at, 183; convocation at, 184, 185; professorial staff at, 186; degree at, 186; student life at, 187; end of, 189; compared with, 189; Tāntrism and, 190; destroyed in, 212, 213; wall at, 213.

INDEX OF IMPORTANT WORDS

A

Abhayamudrā, 132, 135.
 Adhyātmavāda, of Śaṅkara, 83.
 Adhyātmavidya, 142.
 Akṣara, realization of, 4.
 Alayavijñāna, 19, 69.
 Aliḍha, a kind of spiritual posture, 230.
 Anusavanna, meaning, 31.
 Arāma, meaning, 31.
 Ardhaparyāṇika, a kind of spiritual posture, 130, 230.
 Art, Gupta, 232; Pāla, 201; of Nālandā, 101, 232; Nālandā and, 229; at Nālandā, school of, 238.
 Astronomy, part of knowledge, 2; at Nālandā, 85.

B

Bhikkhu, Buddhist, 24, 153; dress of a, 156.
 Brahma, realization of, 4.

C

Caityavandana, rite, 128; description, 129, 130; at Nālandā, 130, 131; at Tāmralipti, 131.
 Chandas, Metre, a branch of study, 10.
 Cikitsāvidyā, subject taught at, 65, 144.

D

Dhyāni Buddha, theory, 91.
 Dhyānamudrā, 133.
 Dharmacakramudrā, 134, 135, 137.

G

Grammar, part of knowledge, 2.

H

Hetuvidyā, 72, 141, 168.

J

Jyotiṣa, Astrology, branch of study, 10.

K

Kālacakrayāna, image, 137, 139.
 Karuṇā, doctrine, 88, 89, 90; symbolism, 97, 231.
 Kevalādvaita, of Śaṅkara, 23.

L

Logic, part of knowledge, 2; students and, 14; Mediaval, 21; subject at, 72; Contribution to, 73; value of, 177.

M

Mādhyamika, Philosophy, 21; works on, 21.
 Mahāsukhavāda, 83, 88, 89, 90.
 Mantrayāna, 161.

N

Natti, meaning, 30.
 Nirātma, 88.
 Nyāya, system, 13; writers on, 14; students' (students') curriculum and, 15.

P

Pāla, Art, Tāntrism and, 177; interpretation of images of, 232; influence of, 234; bronzes of Nālandā and, 235; paintings of, 235 n.

Pandita, meaning, 102.

Parārthānumāna, 73, 74.

Philosophy, part of knowledge, 2; subject taught at, 67, 72; value of, 177.

Prajñā, symbolic meaning, 97.

Prajñopāya, meaning, 97.

S

Śabdavidyā, study of, 141.

Saddhivihārika, 149.

Sādhyasama, fallacy of, 21.

Sāmkhya, system, 10; students' curriculum and, 10; criticism of, 80, 81, 82, 194, 195, 196.

Saṅgha, Buddhist, 25; functions of, 30; character, 31, 32.
 Saṅghakāmma, 30.
 Saṅghārāma, meaning, 24, 227.
 Saṅgīti, a form of Buddhist literature, 89.
 Siddhi, definition, 91; varieties, 91 n, 92 n.
 Sīkṣā, Phonetics, a branch of study, 10.
 Śilpavidyā, 141.
 Śuddhādvaita, of Vallabha, 23.
 Śūnya, 93, 95, 231.
 Śūnyatā, 97, 99.
 Sūtra, literature, 10.

T

Tantra, subject at Nālandā, 86, 86 n. 3; preached in, 89; doctrine, 100; division of, 100; defence of, 100; writers on, 122.
 Tāntric, aims of, 91, 95, 96; qualifications of, 92; culture, 94, 95, 100; practices, 98, 100; images, 131, 137, 139; pantheon, 132.
 Tāntroism, 86; origin, 86; nature, 87; features, 87 n; causes of the rise of, 90; date of, 91; symbolism of, 97; works on, 91; criticism of, 94, 96, 99; educative value of, 94, 101; flourished in, 123; at Nālandā, 94, 101, 209, 210; Pāla, Art and, 177; provincial vernaculars and, 177; Vikramāśilā and, 188, 190; morality and, 188; Jagaddala and, 189.
 Tantrayāna, pantheon, 94, 136, 230; figures of, 136, 137, 139.
 Trairūpa, theory, 74, 75, 76, 77.

Theology, part of knowledge, 2; University education and, 2 n., 4; at Nālandā, 67, 72; value of, 177.

U

University, significance of the word, 1; education and, 2; kinds of students and, 2; India and the word, 3; student in India, 140, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155; student in Europe, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155; life, 162.

Upaniṣad, word and its meaning, 3; formed part of students' curriculum, 9; quoted, 154, 170, 171.

Upāya, symbolic meaning of, 97, 98.

Urṇā, 132.

Uṣṇīṣa, 132.

V

Vajraparyāṇka, 260.

Vajrasattva, 97.

Vajrāsana, 133, 134.

Vajrayāna, symbolism, 97; views on, 98, 99; mentioned, 139.

Vaiśeṣika, system, 15; influence on, 15; Śāntarakṣita and, 79.

Varadamudrā, 133.

Vassā, rain retreat, origin, 24.

Vihāra, description, 38.

Vījñāna, 88.

Viśiṣṭādvaita, of Rāmānuja, 23.

Vyālaka, motif, 134.

Y

Yabyum, meaning, 23, n. 2.

Yavanikā, 164.

Yoga, philosophy, 13; contribution to, 13.

Yogācāra, doctrine, 19; school at Nālandā, 234.

6

Spahl

Malawische Universität

Universität Malawi

Central Archaeological Library,

NEW DELHI.

57346

Call No. 378.1093416 / San

Author—Sankalia, H. D

Title—The University of
Nalanda.

Borrower No.	Date of Issue	Date of Return
J. P. Joshi	25-9-76	22-9-77

"A book that is shut is but a block."

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.